

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8516428

Dedman, Roger

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ART OF ARNOLD SHORE

University of Melbourne (Australia)

PH.D. 1984

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark .

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages _____
8. Print exceeds margin requirements
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____
16. Other _____

University
Microfilms
International

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ART OF ARNOLD SHORE

Roger Dedman

Dissertation for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Fine Arts,
University of Melbourne.

1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Introduction	1
1	Arnold Shore	15
2	The Early Years: 1912-1923	54
3	Post-Impressionist Influences: 1924-1929	84
4	The Bell-Shore School	150
5	Consolidation: 1930-1938	183
6	The Swing to Landscape	244
7	The Later Work: 1949-1963	271
8	The Changing Critical Climate: 1918-1946	290
	Conclusion	313
	Catalogue	325
	Bibliography	397

INTRODUCTION

Arnold Shore is acknowledged as the artist who, together with his close friend William Frater, first introduced modernist painting to Melbourne. The aims of this thesis are three: to determine the extent to which this view is justified; to examine in a broader context Shore's contribution to Australian art; and to trace the development of his painting throughout his career.

The course of the development of modernism in Australia was markedly different from that in Europe. In this context Australian artists suffered from two major disadvantages which could be summarised as their physical, and their philosophical, remove from the artistic centres of Europe.

Australia's geographical distance from Europe offers a quite inadequate explanation for the tardy acceptance here of the European artistic revolution. During the first twelve years of the twentieth century, artists left this country to make the pilgrimage to Europe in a steady stream. The journey was seen then, at least as clearly as now, as mandatory to the expansion of an artist's horizons and aspirations. The expatriates, with a small number of important exceptions, returned to Australia within a few years, but most of them had either not investigated the revolutionary developments taking place in Paris, or had found them beyond their comprehension.

The strength of the conservative, Academy-bound tradition in Melbourne and Sydney could be claimed to have stifled any

modernist outpourings on the part of these returning artists, but the constraints of convention would never have been sufficient completely to repress the expression of radical new ideas and beliefs if those ideas and beliefs had been held with conviction. One explanation lies in the incompatibility of the artistic unrest of Europe, and the social and political unrest on which it was based, with the comparatively comfortable circumstances of most expatriate Australian artists.

The tensions which exploded across the face of Europe in 1914 had been mounting for more than ten years, and this was reflected in the violence of the art of the period - the savage brushstrokes and colour distortions of the fauves, and the cubists' shattering of the picture space. An alternative reaction could be seen on the part of other artists, renouncing in their canvases the real world for the abstract. That Australian artists, having been able to amass enough money to make the trip, if not to live in comfort in Europe, could neither sympathise with nor understand the art produced by these turbulent times is no cause for surprise.

Other reasons for Australia's late adoption of modernism in art can be, and have been, suggested. One which has gained a large degree of general acceptance is the buoyant sense of nationalism which escalated during the years between federation and the first world war. As national pride increased, so did the belief that Australian achievements and institutions could flourish without augmentation or interference from outside. This attitude resulted,

during the first quarter of the century , in a steady decline in our standards of living, education and industrialization, when measured against those standards world wide. This was accompanied by a diminution in the force and originality of Australian art, engendered by a belief in the sanctity of the Heidelberg tradition, and in the decadence of twentieth century European developments.

Another reason for this artistic marking-time is the want, during that period, of any artist or group of artists with sufficient ability, conviction and charisma to mount a serious challenge to the prevailing national artistic heroes.

This last reason must also explain, to a large extent, the delay between Sydney's and Melbourne's first acceptance of modernist principles. There did surface in Melbourne, at about the same time as Datillo Rubbo's students were conducting their first tentative experiments with post-impressionism, an artist with a combination of these three qualities; but Max Meldrum's convictions were of a different stamp, and he led a large number of devoted followers - Shore among them - into a sterile dead-end of stereotyped tonal replicas of his own work.

Meldrum, offering the only alternative to the Academy-based National Gallery school, ensnared any young free spirit who might otherwise have blazed a belated trail into the twentieth century. Shore had to overcome firstly the firmly entrenched reactionary attitudes of his Gallery school teachers, and then the bewitching theories of Meldrum. When he finally did so, in 1924, Melbourne's artistic and critical climate had undergone virtually no change from its pre-war state of

fealty to the traditions of Roberts, Streeton and the Heidelberg school.

During the war and immediately following it, Meldrum's classes offered the only realistic alternative to the Gallery school in Melbourne. Some of his teachings had merit, though they tended to reduce the work of all his students to a common level. Any good, however, was more than nullified by his discouraging his students from studying the work of any other artist. Shore and his fellow students consequently remained unaware of any European developments post-dating impressionism.

The innovative elements which Shore introduced into his paintings from 1924 were a direct result of his subscribing to William Orpen's Outline of Art series. The third last issue contained reproductions of a few works by Cézanne, Gauguin, Van Gogh and Matisse, all but one of them in black-and-white or sepia tones. From these unlikely beginnings sprang Shore's interest in post-impressionism.

Ironically, illustrations with far more potential for innovative inspiration had been languishing, disregarded, in the Victorian State Library for years, between the covers of the British magazine Colour. Had Shore, always an avid reader, not been discouraged from broadening his outlook by Meldrum, these reproductions could have formed the basis for a revision of his views several years earlier.

That Shore should have remained ignorant of developments in Sydney may appear more surprising, but here Meldrum is less to blame. The tone of contemporary articles in Art in Australia, and the choice of reproductions, would have led

a Melbourne reader to conclude that Sydney was equally committed to nineteenth century traditions. Critical neglect may have influenced Wakelin and de Maistre to temper their more audaciously modern tendencies during the twenties, just as it did Shore in the following decade.

Having been introduced to the revelatory ideas inadequately conveyed in the Outline of Art, Shore turned increasingly through the twenties to the reproductions in Colour, the newly established Artwork, and other periodicals. The illustrations they contained represented most of the major European artists who had emerged in the preceding forty years.

Shore's 'modernism', then, consisted in the incorporation of elements drawn from a great variety of artistic sources, all of which had been initially presented to him at much the same time. Furthermore, because most of the periodicals to which he had access were British, and British magazines concentrated on the work of British artists, many of his sources were anglicized versions of French concepts.

Shore would certainly have tried to discover what he could of the theories underlying this eye-opening display of unfamiliar styles, but lucid, unbiased analysis of recent artistic movements was not always to be found in conjunction with the illustrations. Two influences closer to home should also not be ignored: Shore retained the highest regard for the earlier work of the Heidelberg painters, especially Tom Roberts; and Max Meldrum had taught him to paint and had for several years been his unquestioned master. Glimpses of both continued to surface in his work.

The paintings produced by Shore in the years immediately following his break with Meldrum, therefore, were informed by a remarkably broad range of styles, the backgrounds and rationales to the most important of which he imperfectly understood. Little wonder that the paintings from the middle and late twenties display an inconsistency of approach - that startlingly original works, in which aspects of several different European influences emerge, mingle with relatively mundane offerings.

Shore's modernism was also equivocal in that he could not bring himself to accept any of the major European movements post-dating fauvism. He was always to believe that art should be firmly based on nature, and this was to preclude his ever fully appreciating cubism, abstraction or surrealism. In this sense his assimilation of modernist principles was less thorough than Margaret Preston's. In Shore's defence it can be said that he lacked Preston's first-hand experience of painting in Europe, and the financial independence which enabled her to gain that experience and utilize it in Australia. Furthermore, the antagonism to modernism on the part of the reigning arbiters of taste - critics and Gallery trustees - was more bitter in Melbourne than in Sydney.

Although he always referred to himself as a modernist, the description is a misnomer, except in a comparative sense in the context of Melbourne painting prior to his departure from the Bell-Shore school. From that time, even in Melbourne, he was not among the most advanced artists in the sense of keeping in touch with European developments. Younger painters,

several of whom had been students of Shore's, were experimenting in fields into which he could not bring himself to venture.

This does not in any way belittle Shore's achievements. The eventual success of Drysdale, Purves-Smith and Thake - and later of the 'rebels and precursors' of Richard Haese's study - owed a great deal to the pioneering work of Shore. By continuing to exhibit works which questioned the pre-eminence of the atrophying Australian landscape tradition, with its roots firmly in the nineteenth century, Shore gradually forced his critics and the public to take a more tolerant view of alternative modes of artistic expression. He can not, of course, take all the credit for this more enlightened attitude, but he did more to foster it than any other artist in Melbourne.

In 1977, Patrick McCaughey suggested that Shore's role as "pioneer modernist, as teacher and critic has unfairly outweighed his reputation as a painter."¹ This thesis examines the pioneering aspects of his work during the twenties and thirties, but devotes little space to Shore as a teacher or a critic. In his teaching he was subordinate - firstly to Meldrum during a brief period in the early twenties, and later to George Bell in the school they ran together from 1932 to 1936. Most of the theories and practices taught at the Bell-Shore school originated with the more experienced Bell, and the students of the school who were to establish reputations of their own were protégés of Bell's rather than of Shore's.

1 In the foreword to the catalogue, 'The Later Work of Arnold Shore', Powell Street Gallery, 1977.

Nor was Shore particularly influential as a critic. He was fair in his comments, and had the respect of most artists whose work he reviewed, but he was perhaps too kind. No doubt remembering the succession of insensitive and unflattering reviews of his own work during the twenties and early thirties, he hesitated to criticize severely, concentrating on the virtues rather than the failings of exhibitions he visited. On the other hand, although his judgement is seen with hindsight to have been sound, he was rarely effusive, so that his distinctions between the worthless and the worthwhile were expressed too circumspectly to affect the public's views.

It is as an artist that Shore should be assessed. When his part as a 'pioneer modernist' had been played, when the vanguard of artistic progress in Melbourne had been appropriated by younger artists moving into areas beyond Shore's full appreciation, his contribution to Australian art was far from over. From the late thirties he deliberately divorced himself from the political turmoil of the Melbourne art world, privately expressing an intense distaste for its in-fighting and bickering.

At Macedon during the war years he developed a highly individualistic style on which all his later work was based. At a time when most other Australian artists were using landscape only as a setting for the exploration of social issues, Shore continued to treat it as a worthy subject in its own right. Unlike the work of so many of the artists who worked in Melbourne in the early forties, Shore's gives no indication of world turmoil. The colours are as brilliant, the application of paint as exuberant as ever, reflecting

his state of mind during what were his most contented years.

This dissociation of his art from the larger social and political issues surrounding him is in part responsible for Shore's neglect by art historians. His work lacks the punch of Counihan, the shock-power of wartime Tucker and Perceval, the incisiveness of Nolan, the social comment of Boyd. Shore's art may be criticized for failing to grapple with the social evils of wartime, but social or political relevance has never been a prerequisite for worthwhile art. Often too great a concern for allusive content has undermined an artist's aesthetic integrity - a criticism which could be levelled at much work done in Melbourne during the forties.

Shore's concerns were not those of a younger generation of artists whose youth was being despoiled by the poisoned atmosphere of a country at war. That he was able to enjoy some modest critical acclaim at a time when little attention was paid to John Reed's protégés should not be allowed to overshadow the fact that he had tenaciously endured years of ridicule and neglect without even the encouragement of an understanding patron.

The late forties brought profound changes to Shore's personal life. A year during which no painting was attempted was succeeded by a longer period of artistic uncertainty and little productivity. The paintings from the last few years of his life, however, display an assurance and consistency not always evident in earlier works. They represent the culmination of an interrupted line of development which can be traced from its roots in the European reproductions seen during the twenties, through the experimental and

consolidatory phases of the thirties, to the mature and highly individual style of the forties and beyond.

Shore's reputation during his lifetime suffered from the vagaries of fashion. When, during the twenties, he first began to experiment with styles which did not accord with the time-worn traditions in which Melbourne was then steeped, he received no encouragement. This lack of public and critical interest, together with the inaccessibility of original contemporary European works and the limited support he received from fellow artists, restricted his own development. Much of his work of the thirties now appears less advanced than his best from the twenties.

In the period immediately following his departure from the Bourke Street school in 1936, Shore began to attract some critical acclaim in the form of prizes; but his winning entries generally lack the originality and verve characteristic of both his earlier and later work. In retiring to Macedon in 1939, Shore chose not to capitalize on this success. The move enabled him to develop in directions uncompromised by the expectations of others - either conservative administrators or the more militant artists associated with the Contemporary Art Society.

Shore had stepped out of the mainstream of modernism, and had passed from the neglect accorded progressives in a conservative society to that accorded the old guard at a time of interest in the innovative. That he achieved so much with so little encouragement is remarkable; that his achievements have not until now received the recognition they deserve is no less so.

The organization of the thesis is primarily chronological. The first chapter presents an outline biography of Shore's life, concentrating on events relevant to his work, but considering none of the paintings in detail. This facilitates reference to future events where necessary in the following chapters, as well as setting in a broader context each of the periods subsequently examined in more detail.

Chapter 2 is concerned with Shore's student days at the Gallery school and under the pervasive influence of Max Meldrum. The very few extant works from these years show him progressing from competent, but uninspired student works to discipleship to Meldrum. There is, however, even at this stage, a glimmer of the colour sense which was to become one of his major strengths.

The next section opens with Shore's introduction to twentieth-century artistic thought through Orpen's Outline of Art and closes with his first one-man exhibition in 1929. Considerable space is devoted to establishing 1924 as the year in which this revelation took place, and to discrediting a conflicting version propounded by William Frater. The principal problem addressed in this chapter is the determination of influences affecting Shore's work at this critical stage of his development. Reproductions accessible to Shore through periodicals held in the Victorian State Library receive particular attention, as they provided his only direct contact with contemporary European painting.

In the early thirties, George Bell replaced Frater as Shore's closest associate. Chapter 4 covers the history of the Bell-Shore school, particularly as it affected Shore, and the relationship between the two partners. Chapter 5 examines

the paintings produced in the years spanning Shore's period with Bell. It will be argued that, despite signs of the first glimmerings of its acceptance in the early thirties, Shore's work regressed slightly during his years at the school. This was due to a combination of failing confidence in an uncertain economic climate, the tempering influence of Bell, and the imagined responsibility of maintaining a consistent approach to his work for the sake of his students.

During his association with Bell, however, Shore had taken advantage of the availability of quality European art periodicals and reproductions, and the increased amount of free time which teaching at the school allowed him, to study the work of a wide range of twentieth century European artists. New influences began to emerge in his work, including those of Van Gogh, Vlaminck and, particularly, Matthew Smith. During the late thirties and increasingly through the forties, Shore blended these new influences with aspects of the Australian landscape tradition in the studies of the bush which now occupied most of his time and interest. This swing to landscape, and the stylistic changes accompanying it, are the concerns of Chapter 6.

Chapter 7 takes Shore from his return to Melbourne in 1948, through the sickness-blighted fifties to the productive years preceding his death in 1963. Again a period of uncertainty is superseded by one of great originality and assurance. The final chapter examines the changing tenor of critical comment, through a survey of reviews of exhibitions in which Shore took part, from the end of the first world war to the end of the second. This throws light not only on Shore's own advances, but also on the reactionary forces against

which he had to battle, especially during the twenties, and on the gradual mellowing of this opposition.

To this date very little has been published on Shore or his work. The only published articles devoted to Shore are three very brief articles in Art in Australia during the thirties, another by Arthur Cook in Meanjin in 1950, and John Hetherington's essay in his Australian Painters.¹ The George Bell School, by Mary Eagle and Jan Minchin, contains considerable material on Shore, but concentrates on his work as a teacher at the Bourke Street school.²

The evidence on which this thesis is based falls principally into three categories: writings (mostly unpublished) of the artist and his contemporaries; interviews with those who knew him; and, most importantly, the paintings themselves.

Shore was an avid keeper of records, and a prolific and competent writer. During Bell's absence from the school in 1934-5, and regularly from 1949, he wrote reviews and occasional articles for several newspapers and magazines. These writings are of limited assistance, as Shore tended to be guarded in his criticism, and managed to conceal most of his private prejudices.

Far more informative are three lengthy autobiographical manuscripts written at different stages of his career. The earliest closes with his move to Macedon, and was probably written during his first few years there. The latest, dated

1 All detailed in the Bibliography.

2 Eagle, M. and Minchin, J., The George Bell School: Students, Friends, Influences, Deutscher, Melbourne, 1981. Much of the information on Shore was contributed by the present author, including the outline of Shore's career on pp256-9.

February 1963 (three months before his death) on its final page, reveals more of his personal beliefs and experiences, but is less reliable historically. It appears to have been written without reference to the earlier manuscript.¹ The third is undated, written in the third person, and concerned with his childhood and adolescence.

These autobiographies will be referred to as AMSA, AMSB and AMSC respectively. Reference is made to the first two throughout the thesis, and together they constitute by far the most important documentary evidence available. These manuscripts are essential for an accurate reconstruction of Shore's career, and they also contain many references to other artists of the period, particularly William Frater and George Bell. The author is deeply indebted to Shore's widow, Mrs Agnes Shore, for, among many other things, allowing access to these extremely personal documents.

Every effort has been made to trace Shore's extant works, most of which are in private hands. The catalogue at the end of the thesis comprises all known works, together with separate listings, compiled from catalogues, of works exhibited throughout Shore's career but now lost.

As Shore dated nearly all the paintings he completed after 1930, the tracing of his development from that time is rarely complicated by a work whose date is uncertain. In all but the rarest cases, undated works can be allocated a date through the application of external evidence. Particularly useful in this respect is Shore's sales book, which he carefully maintained from 1931 until 1953. In several

1 Shore may have believed he had destroyed the earlier manuscript. He told his wife that he had done so, but she discovered it among his papers in 1981.

instances it contains information about individual paintings unavailable elsewhere. The sales book is referred to often during the course of the thesis, as well as throughout the catalogue. In a few examples from the twenties or earlier, the date is uncertain, and recourse is made to a dating argued on stylistic grounds.

Administrators of public collections and private owners have been most generous in granting access to works in their possession, and have been unstinting in providing assistance in many other ways. This thesis is a tribute to their interest, as well as to an artist whose contribution to Australian art is overdue for thorough assessment.

CHAPTER ONE
ARNOLD SHORE

The exuberance of Arnold Shore's vivid flowerpieces and rich landscapes provides a marked contrast with his own life and character. A less than happy childhood presaged a maturity beset by bouts of depression, but only rarely does any hint of gloom invade his paintings. This quietly spoken, reserved man was the product of a conventional upbringing which bordered on the repressive. To a casual acquaintance, his conservative appearance and demeanour gave no indication of the vivacity of his mature paintings or of the innovatory nature of his early work. He was a man who lived and expressed himself through his art.

The depression of the 1890s affected the family of John and Harriet Shore particularly severely. Towards the end of the property boom of the late 1880s, the Shores were living in a small cottage in Union Street, Windsor, a working class suburb some five kilometres from the centre of Melbourne. They decided to mortgage this house, not yet fully paid for, to finance the purchase of a block of land and the construction of a new house in the more prestigious suburb of Malvern.

When the boom collapsed, and John Shore lost his regular employment, they were unable to pay two years' council rates on the Malvern land, and were forced to vacate the new house clandestinely, forfeiting their investment. Fearful of discovery, the family returned to the Union Street cottage, now burdened with a heavy mortgage.

The prospects of John Shore, a coachbuilder and blacksmith by trade, did not revive with the rest of the economy. His wife supplemented their irregular income by knitting men's neckties in football club colours and hawking them around city shops. Into this struggling family Arnold Joseph Victor Shore was born on May 5, 1897.

Arnold was the youngest of seven children. His unplanned arrival came six years after his nearest sister's, and eighteen years after the birth of his eldest surviving brother. The first born, named John after his father, had died at the age of thirteen months, apparently as the result of a faulty prescription by a local doctor. When Arnold was born, both his father, a second generation Australian, and his mother, who had arrived in Australia from England at the age of thirteen, were in their forties and "definitely 19th century minded."¹

Arnold's home life was strictly regimented and oppressive, if not loveless. The childhood memories which remained with him most vividly, to be recorded in detail at the age of sixty-five, were largely of embarrassment and disappointment. Comparable experiences, however, could be found in most contemporary childhoods; the significant feature of Shore's is that they continued to be resented after he had reached adulthood.

Arnold performed well at school, but even events which should have been remembered fondly were usually accompanied by some unpleasant aspect which marred the memory in later years. When he topped the class, his arch

1 AMSB, pl.

rival's absence on the final day rendered the victory hollow; a promised prize in religious instruction was never presented; half-a-crown promised by his brother for the successful completion of his Merit certificate proved to be beyond the means of the newly-married brother when the examination was passed.

The young Shore, in common with most boys of his age, would have preferred sporting prowess to academic success. He showed little natural talent at games, and his acute lack of confidence did nothing for his physical performance. In retrospect he laid the blame for this inability partly on his parents' lack of encouragement and assistance, and on their insistence that he come straight home from school each day instead of practising cricket or football.

The few pleasurable recollections from his school years are significant. In AMSA he recalls only two: his discovery that he could borrow books from the school library, and a teacher's reading of a translation of Homer's Odyssey.¹ He became and remained an avid reader. He sold many of his more valuable books shortly before his death, but the remaining collection (still intact in Mrs Agnes Shore's possession) was large and wide-ranging. This library has been of some assistance in determining his awareness of overseas developments, and reference will be made to it in later chapters.

There is no doubt that his predilection for reading contributed to his own artistic development, as it was

1 AMSA, p2.

British and European periodicals and books which alerted him to the possibilities beyond his own conventional artistic training. It was also certainly the breadth of his literary experience, rather than his limited formal education, which fitted him for the positions of critic and guide-lecturer. His written expression was fluent and accurate. If it lacked flair and polish, that was no great disadvantage in writing exhibition reviews; and in the autobiographical manuscripts it reflects the author's personality and the spontaneous nature of his recollections.

One other happy childhood memory was of Sunday rail-trips to the country. Arnold responded enthusiastically to the bush, as he was always to do, and the excursions gave father and son a rare opportunity to enjoy each other's company in less formal circumstances than existed at home. Years later, after his father's death, a revival of this Sunday tradition allowed Arnold and his mother to escape the increasingly claustrophobic atmosphere of the Union Street house.

Despite his ability at school there was no question of Arnold's education proceeding beyond primary school. He spent two years in the senior primary class because it was not possible to be awarded the Merit certificate, the acknowledgement of a satisfactorily completed primary education, until the age of twelve. Having passed it, he was expected by his parents to begin work. His eldest brother Charles worked as a foreman glass-cutter at the city firm of Brooks Robinson, and arranged a job there for Arnold as office-boy and general rouseabout.

Charles had left school during the depression of the early 1890s and, unable to find work in Victoria, had gone to Western Australia where he learned glass-cutting and glazing while working in a timber yard. This skill, acquired almost by chance, resulted indirectly in Arnold's being launched on his artistic career. Had there been no connection between drawing and Arnold's chosen trade, his parents would not have given him permission to enrol at the National Gallery school; and had the stained-glass designer Horace Picking not suggested the school to Shore, his art training may have been delayed indefinitely.

There was little in Arnold's family life to incline him towards art except his father's hobby of wood-carving. John Shore's carved panels were meticulously executed, and some of them display a sound grasp of form and an elegance of line and design (Pl 192). There is no suggestion in the memoirs, however, that Arnold ever discussed them, or any other form of art, with his father. There was not a close relationship:

I was indeed over-dominated by my mother. Father, if he had any inclination towards influencing me except indirectly, rarely showed it. (AMSB, p22)

His mother offered no encouragement to any activity without direct bearing on his future security - perhaps, in view of the family's financial difficulties, an understandable attitude. Even when Arnold had established himself as an artist she appears to have shown little interest in his paintings.

Shore's first two years at Brooks Robinson were spent in sweeping floors and running messages. At the end of that time he was offered an apprenticeship in lead-lighting. He was occasionally asked to help out in the designing department, and this more creative work held greater appeal than the apprenticeship tasks. His stints at designing, however, had to be concealed from his mother, who insisted on devotion to learning the trade.

In the designing department he met William Frater with whom, despite the differences in seniority and age¹, he was to develop a lifelong friendship. Unlike Picking, Frater tried to discourage the young Shore from persevering with his sketching - not, apparently, because of any lack of promise in Shore's early drawings, but as general counsel to any budding artist.

Shore enrolled in the evening drawing class at the National Gallery school in 1912 and continued his part-time studies there until 1917. After a working day starting at eight o'clock and finishing at five-thirty, he would catch the train home to Windsor for his evening meal then rush back to the Gallery in time for the 7 P.M. class, five nights a week.

1 Frater, born January 31, 1890, was more than seven years older than Shore. He had arrived in Australia from Scotland in 1910 and worked at Brooks Robinson for a year before returning home. Shore probably knew him during this period, as the office-boy's work took him to all departments. Frater returned to Australia in 1914 and resumed his position at Brooks Robinson, where he had been held in the highest regard. In 1915 he transferred to the rival glass-making firm of Yenckens, but he and Shore continued to meet regularly. Frater and his relationship with Shore will be considered in more detail in Chapter 3.

Despite five years of this regimen, Shore did not believe that his drawing had improved significantly. Frederick McCubbin, the drawing master, passed on his love of art but little else. Bernard Hall, the director of the Gallery and head of the painting school, visited the evening class only rarely; on those occasions his criticism of the work being done was scathing but hardly constructive. It was with surprise that Shore learned, after leaving the school, that Hall had considered him a pupil of great promise.

The first two years at the school were spent copying casts, progressing slowly from one part of the anatomy to another until at last a cast of the whole figure could be attempted. The thrill of finally being admitted to the life class was quickly dissipated with the realization that the endless repetitions, without guidance, were to be continued, now from a living model. "We were supposed to be studying," he later wrote. "All we were doing was wasting good paper." (AMSA, p6) Shore's only recognized success at the school came in 1916 when he was awarded the prize for a charcoal drawing of a cast from an antique sculpture - a circular bas-relief of the holy family by Michelangelo.

Shore's first attempt at painting landscape from nature was made shortly after starting at the Gallery school. He and a fellow student (whose name is not given in either of the accounts in AMSA and AMSB) travelled to Eltham by train with boxes of watercolours. Their only instruction to that time had been drawing from casts, and the results

were predictably disappointing. Shore was not deterred, and he began making regular painting excursions to the country with the brothers John and Will Rowell.

These trips were extended, after Arnold's mother's reservations had been overcome, to weekend camps at Ringwood. John Rowell, three years older than Arnold and a student in the daytime painting class at the Gallery, painted in oils, but Shore could afford only watercolours. None of these sketches has survived. His earliest extant works are three oil sketches on cardboard rescued from the family wood-box by his sister Alice, and said by her to have been painted when Arnold was eighteen.¹ As John Rowell joined the painting class at the National Gallery school in 1914, this places the Ringwood camping trips in 1914-1915.

Shore's manuscripts make little mention of the war and its effects, but one short extract outlining his attitude to it shows the extent to which he was still dominated by his mother.

I had turned eighteen in 1915, but despite all the public pressure to induce every man to enlist, I could not make the plunge. Quite apart from the fact that I was temperamentally inhibited against becoming a soldier, there were more legitimate reasons which debarred me. Father was now markedly failing, and mother would have bitterly opposed any attempt on my part to leave her. (AMSB, pl9)

¹ This information is given in a letter to the author from Mr Bruce Ingles, Alice Shore's grandson, and owner of the three oil sketches.

Had he chosen to enlist, the break may have enabled him to escape the family bonds which were to stifle him for the next twenty years.

Towards the end of his period at the Gallery school, Shore joined the Victorian Artists' Society.¹ His first works were exhibited in the annual show of 1917, and two of his four entries sold. He showed works in only four VAS exhibitions before leaving the Society shortly after Meldrum resigned in 1918. He was to rejoin the VAS in 1949 and eventually became its president. The most important outcome of his early membership, however, was his introduction to Max Meldrum.

His first contact with Meldrum's paintings left Shore unimpressed. His "curiously dark, low-in-tone landscapes and portraits . . . held no attraction for me" (AMSB, p46); but the two men were brought together by a workmate who asked Shore to introduce him to Meldrum. Somewhat reluctantly Shore took the workmate to Meldrum's studio during a lunch hour. Hal Rooney, who had become a close friend of Shore's at Brooks Robinson, accompanied them.

Meldrum's theories, and the examples he showed them of his private students' work, so impressed Shore and Rooney that they agreed to return on the following Saturday afternoon. The workmate who had requested the first visit

1 In an article in the Argus, July 2, 1951, mentioning the Society's appeal for funds, Shore wrote that he remembered showing his first efforts at the 'Vics' before the first world war. This is not borne out by VAS catalogues, and must be an aberration of memory. Shore could well have visited VAS exhibitions before the war, as his friend Frater exhibited with the Society as early as 1913.

did not make the second, but by the end of the afternoon "Rooney and I were completely captured." (AMSB, p48)

Meldrum's public classes opened in 1917. Shore was a foundation member and was associated with the school as both pupil and tutor until it closed in 1923. The strict theories and step-by-step methods at first appealed to Shore, frustrated by the lack of guidance he had received at the Gallery school. It was while working under Meldrum that he realised for the first time that art was more than the precise imitation of nature. That he could have spent five years at the Gallery school without having this truism suggested to him, and without recognizing it himself, is symptomatic of the rigidly narrow approach taken by Hall and McCubbin in their teaching.

It was not Meldrum's theories or practice which enlightened him - they too were designed to produce an illusionistic representation of the subject; it was the limitations of Meldrum's teachings and their stereotyped results. Typically, however, Shore lacked the self-confidence to leave Meldrum; he stayed until the number of students had dropped to such an extent that Meldrum was forced to disband the school and give private lessons at home to the few devotees who remained. This lack of resolve on Shore's part is understandable. He was still dissatisfied with the work he was producing and had now exhausted the apparent avenues of guidance towards improvement.

Shortly after the war Shore's father, unable to find any work in his field, took a series of positions as a houseman in the country. He left Melbourne reluctantly and (according to Arnold, AMSB, p50) only at the insistence of his wife. He continued this unhappy existence for some years, rarely seeing his family, until he returned home, ill and depressed in 1922. Arnold's sister Ida, then living in Tasmania, invited her father to live with her. He went immediately and spent some months there, but towards the end of that year his condition worsened, and he died on December 30, 1922.

Arnold's version of his father's last few years gives further insight into the dominant and domineering position which his mother held in the family, at least in the eyes of her youngest son. He believed that his father's death meant little to her, as her mental faculties were now declining. (AMSB, p52) Arnold himself felt his father's loss keenly despite having had little direct contact with him at any time.

Shore spent the holidays in which his father's death fell working on a still life of a Chinese figure (Pl 10). This painting was chosen for the exhibition of Australian art held at Burlington House, London, in 1923. Despite very limited public exposure, Shore's work had begun to attract some attention. Selections for the Burlington House exhibition were made by George Bell and W.B.McInnes. This was Shore's first contact with Bell, whose strong stand on the inclusion of works by Victorian artists particularly impressed Shore.

Shore had acquired the habit of meeting Frater every lunch hour during the working week. The discussion usually turned to art, and their experiments began to take similar paths. Frater had frequented Meldrum's classes without formally becoming a student. He had on several occasions been asked by Meldrum not to come, as he disputed some of the master's theories and disturbed the students.

Frater had incorporated some Meldrumesque elements into his work from the time of his meeting Meldrum during the war, but at no stage embraced his theories as wholeheartedly as did Shore. Frater's questioning of Meldrum's tenets no doubt played a part in weaning Shore away from them.

Following the closure of Meldrum's school, and prior to the revelation engendered by their exposure to post-impressionist reproductions, Shore and Frater both turned to older masters for inspiration. "Rembrandt became my God," wrote Shore. "Claude, Poussin and Richard Wilson were Frater's heroes." (AMSA, p64) Shore occasionally visited Frater at his home in Alplington, but had few other contacts outside working hours.

A self-portrait on which Shore had spent many hours was taken to show Frater. Shore was surprised and hurt when Frater complimented it obliquely ("if you can paint portraits of women as good as that, your fortune's made"), and shattered when Frater's assistant, Pat Harford, compared it to the work of the Hon. John Collier, whom

Shore considered the epitome of Academic banality (Pl 12). This experience had a profound effect on Shore. It is recorded at length in each of his autobiographies¹, and its vividness in his memory many years later is shown by the similarity of the accounts. He was led to question seriously whether he should continue painting.

It was Pat Harford who first spoke of Cézanne and Picasso to Shore, and who first disputed Shore's naive belief that art should aim at the perfect reproduction of nature. There are discrepancies in the evidence relating to the date of these discussions which will be investigated further in Chapter 3. It is certain, however, that Shore's painting style was not influenced by any post-impressionist artist until the later issues of Orpen's Outline of Art arrived in Melbourne. This could not have been earlier than 1924.

Shortly after Meldrum's school closed, Shore became a member of the Twenty Melbourne Painters group. Frater had been a foundation member when the group was established in 1919, but Shore declined to join at that time because of his loyalty to Meldrum. His first exhibits with the TMP were hung at the fifth annual exhibition in August 1923, and from that time he exhibited with the society at each of its annual shows until 1946. The TMP provided Shore with his only regular means of exhibiting paintings during the twenties and early thirties.

1 AMSA, pp65-7; AMSB, pp57-8; FYSF.

From 1924 Shore's painting underwent radical changes which will be examined in detail in Chapter 3. His personal life was far more static. Now his mother's sole support and companion, he was more closely tied to home than ever. She expected his constant attention when he was not at work and his painting opportunities were consequently limited.

Early in 1925¹ he suffered his first serious bout of mental depression. This began with a few days away from work with influenza, but when the illness lifted the depression did not.

My nerves cracked. The will to eat, drink, or act in any way other than miserably, left me. Sleep became impossible . . . Suicide became an obsession. (AMSA, p74)

Shore began to despise himself for his inability to find the courage to commit suicide. His visits to Brooks Robinson became irregular. The manager decided to stop paying him for days absent from work, and this news, brought to him one evening by Hal Rooney, finally inspired Shore to break out of his trough of self-loathing.

On returning to a normal working routine, Shore resolved to concentrate on his trade and abandoned painting altogether for about five months. He tried to stop seeing Frater, but his friend would agree only to reducing the frequency of their meetings to once a week. The extent to which Frater encouraged and stood by him at this time left Shore profoundly grateful.

1 The timing of this breakdown and the subsequent period of inactivity will be discussed in Chapter 3.

During his five-month break from painting, Shore decided that he should begin his artistic training again from scratch. Despite the time he had spent in the Gallery drawing school, he believed draughtsmanship to be his major weakness. He struggled with basic lessons in drawing and perspective from the multi-volume 'Universal Educator'¹, and copied diagrams from books on anatomy. He found that he had lost his powers of concentration, and his memory continually failed him.

The end of this period of dejection and inactivity began with Shore's decision to take his mother out of the house on Sundays, at first for walks and tram-trips through the suburbs and eventually into the country. His descriptions of these pitiful excursions emphasize the claustrophobic existence which both had led since his father's death, and leave no doubt that the circumstances of his home life had contributed to his breakdown.

Frater kept encouraging Shore to resume painting, and the imminence of the TMP exhibition² inspired him to begin work again. At about the same time he was given a new position at Brooks Robinson involving the design and preparation of small scale sketches for submission to

1 AMSA, p77. The National Union Catalogue of Pre-1956 Imprints contains no record of any work so titled. The reference was probably the Universal Encyclopaedia, published in six volumes in Toronto in 1919, NU Catalogue, Vol. 625, p177.

2 Shore writes: "I was a member of painting Societies whose exhibitions were due" (AMSA, p83), but the TMP is the only society of which he appears to have been a member at that time. The exhibition was probably that held in September 1925.

customers when tendering for jobs. This work, providing opportunities for greater creativity and more contact with other workers and clients, appealed strongly. Shore began to see his breakdown as a blessing which had enabled him to appreciate his everyday existence.

Jo Sweatman, who lived and painted at Warrandyte, invited Shore and his mother to visit on one of their Sunday outings.¹ The success of the trip led Shore to rent a house at Warrandyte for the forthcoming holidays. Frater and his two sons shared the rented house with Shore and his mother. Although the holiday was not an unqualified success ("Mother grizzled and fussed, and would not be even moderately content if I was out of her sight," AMSA, p88), Shore tried again the following Easter, this time without Frater in a smaller cottage at Warrandyte.

On his return from this second holiday, Shore was introduced by Frater to Horace Brandt. Frater had known Brandt for some time but discovered only by accident that he was an artist. Brandt was to have a considerable influence on the work of both Frater and Shore - more, it will be argued, than any other local artist after Meldrum. He had no desire for publicity, and when he accepted Frater's invitation to exhibit with the TMP in September 1927 he chose to sign all works with his mother's name, M.A.de Chimay. Disappointingly little of Brandt's

1 Jo Sweatman was a foundation member of the Twenty Melbourne Painters. The invitation was probably issued at the time of the 1925 TMP exhibition in September.

work has survived, nor is anything known of his training and experience before his arrival in Australia, beyond that revealed in an article he wrote for the VAS journal in 1911.¹

From 1927, the work of Shore, Frater and Brandt was isolated on the west wall of the Athenaeum Gallery in TMP exhibitions. They were later joined by Isabel Tweddle (born 1877, and so twenty years older than Shore) who was greatly influenced by Frater, and to some extent by Shore. These four, aggrieved at their neglect in reviews of the TMP shows², agreed to mount a joint exhibition. In February 1929 Shore made a booking with the Athenaeum Gallery for the earliest available time, in August of that year. Almost immediately the other three withdrew from the scheme, and Shore decided to proceed with a solo exhibition.

During that six-month period Shore experienced what he called "pre-exhibition paralysis," so that by August he could produce only fifteen oils. The exhibition had to be filled out with pastel sketches and drawings, most of which George Bell described in his review as "too slight to deserve exhibition."³ Most critics, however, reviewed

- 1 Brandt, H.A., 'Old Master Impressions in Galleries Abroad', The V.A.S.: A Journal of the Arts, Series 1, No. 1, July 1, 1911, p2.
- 2 This is Shore's explanation. He writes: "the local critics, without exception, completely ignored our existence for several years," AMSA, p92. This is a gross exaggeration. Critical comment was neither kind nor extensive but it was certainly not nonexistent. See Chapter 7.
- 3 Sun, August 13, 1929, p23.

the exhibition quite kindly, if not enthusiastically. The few sales, mostly to friends, covered most of the expenses.

In the following year Shore, Brandt and two other artists¹ decided to send four pictures each to the Paris Salon d'Automne. A flowerpiece of Shore's (Pl 63) was accepted for exhibition, but the other entries were rejected. Brandt received this news with disbelief, and asked Shore to pay his share of the considerable expenses involved, in return for Brandt's four pictures when they were returned - an offer which Shore accepted. Brandt later tried to claim Shore and Frater as his disciples. They naturally objected, and their relationship ended in an unpleasant scene. Shore wrote that "shortly after this" Brandt gave up painting (AMSA, p100A), but this must have been no earlier than mid-1932 as seven works by de Chimay were exhibited in the Contemporary Group (Melbourne) show of August 1932:

Shore had continued to holiday at Warrandyte with his mother during the late twenties, on one occasion commuting to work in the city each day in the car he had bought at Frater's instigation. Despite the time spent in travelling (the round trip was some sixty kilometres), the experience determined him to live at Warrandyte permanently. To this end, Shore purchased three blocks at a sale of government land and over the next few weeks had it fenced, cleared

1 One of these two is identified by Shore as Kerr-Morgan, another designer at Brooks Robinson who became a close friend; the other is referred to only as "another young painter." (AMSA, p100A)

and dammed. But his mother's flat refusal to move put an end to the scheme, as Shore had counted on the rental of the Windsor cottage to finance the construction of a new house.

This land was to provide further disappointment for Shore when he and Basil Burdett became involved with a gold-mining venture on it during 1931. His position with Brooks Robinson had by this time become precarious through the continuation of the downturn in the stained-glass trade. Work was available only on an irregular basis, his finances were running low, and the possibility of gold being found on his land offered promise of an existence free of financial worry. By the time this dream had been conclusively shattered, his savings were exhausted. It was then that he approached George Bell with the proposal of starting a school together.

The establishment of the school, and its four-and-a-half years of joint proprietorship will be treated fully in Chapter 4. In that period, as a direct result of his association with the school, Shore's life changed dramatically. Throughout his earlier adult life he had been ruled on the one hand by his trade work - either working long hours or, in the early thirties, worrying about the diminishing work available - and on the other by the demands of his mother.

At the school, Bell and he took turns at teaching for a week at a time.¹ Although the non-teaching partner

1 Or for a fortnight. Both arrangements are mentioned in Shore's manuscripts, and the organization of the teaching loads was no doubt flexible.

normally spent much of his time painting in a small back studio, the arrangement still provided Shore with more free time than he had previously enjoyed. His mother's health deteriorated to the extent that she needed a permanent housekeeper-companion, and this relieved Shore of much of his responsibility at home. A widening circle of friends issued invitations to social functions which Shore only now felt able to accept. Previously his mother's objections to being left alone had virtually precluded his going anywhere without her, and he had adopted the habit of refusing most invitations.

When Bell asked for a dissolution of the partnership in September 1936, Shore was stunned, but agreed readily enough, realising the impossibility of continuing in an antagonistic atmosphere. His increased income during Bell's absence overseas - the result both of taking over Bell's various professional duties and of increasing sales of his own pictures - had placed him in a sound financial position, and he decided to concentrate on his own painting rather than look for another job.

Having become accustomed to the comparative luxury of the Bourke Street school, Shore found his backyard studio quite inadequate and rented a second-floor studio in Toorak Road, South Yarra, almost above the South Yarra railway station. He had been forced to sell his car during the lean period which preceded his partnership with Bell, but the new studio was within two kilometres of his home and could be reached in a few minutes by train. It was also only a short walk from the guest house where Mrs Grandy Lemann lived.

Shore had been introduced to Mrs Lemann by Lady Barrett, an elderly woman who was one of the students at the Bourke Street school. Mrs Lemann was considerably older than Shore, though younger than Lady Barrett. Shore's relationship with her developed slowly, principally because of his inexperience with women and a consequent total lack of self-confidence in sexual matters. Ironically, the encouragement and experience he needed were provided by a friend of Mrs Lemann's who lived at the same guest house. The two widows normally shared a table in the dining-room where Shore was often invited to dinner.

In his manuscripts Shore gives little indication of this friend's identity, but describes her as "a very forceful, one time Lancashire woman."¹ He had painted a portrait of her², and this had resulted in occasional invitations to spend an evening with her. Their relationship was shortlived. After a few months the widow fell ill and died, causing Shore to feel guilty of having hastened her death. He does not mention her age, but on the basis of her friendship with Mrs Lemann, her circumstances, and her illness and death, it is probable that she too was considerably older than Shore.

The years immediately following Shore's break with Bell were his most successful both financially and in terms of

- 1 Nor does he give the names of Mrs Lemann or Lady Barrett, but they can be identified from other evidence, including Shore's portraits of them, letters in his possession, and the testimony of those who knew him at the time.
- 2 It has not been possible to trace this work. The sitters in all of Shore's known female portraits can be positively identified.

public recognition. A small number of prestigious portrait commissions came his way. Income from the sale of his pictures increased dramatically in both 1937 and 1938.¹ Camellias (Pl 103), bought by the National Gallery of Victoria from the 1937 TMP show, was Shore's first sale to a public gallery.² In 1940 the NGV bought its second Shore, The Vegetable Garden (Pl 135), and by that year Shore was also represented in state galleries in Brisbane and Adelaide. The Art Gallery of N.S.W. bought its first Shore, a still life (Pl 136), in 1941.

In the same period Shore was awarded several important prizes. Basil Burdett, as art critic for the Herald, arranged an exhibition in March 1938 of the best paintings exhibited in the previous year. Two works by Shore were chosen, and Burdett awarded the title of Best Picture of 1937 jointly to Shore's Roses (Pl 93), which had been

- 1 Shore's sales book lists all sales from 1931 until 1953, giving for most works a title or description, the medium and the price, and for some the name of the purchaser. At the end of each year is given a total for that year, somewhat ambiguously labelled "Total sales less commission." In some cases the price corresponds with that quoted in an exhibition catalogue, still clearly subject to deduction; in others, the price given is equally clearly nett of commission. The total sales for the years 1931 to 1934 were respectively (to the nearest pound) £22, £51, £32 and £31. In 1935, during most of which Bell was overseas, the total jumped to £156. After £136 in 1936, the totals leaped again to £313 in 1937 and £569 in 1938. Following his move to Macedon in February 1939, the sales figures dropped away again, averaging £160 per annum during his eight years there.
- 2 He was already represented in the NGV by a chalk drawing, but this had been presented to the Gallery by Daryl Lindsay, in 1934.

shown in the Group 12 exhibition in June¹, and John Longstaff's Grey Evening. The award carried a prize of fifty pounds which was shared by the two artists. In 1938 Shore also won Ballarat's Crouch Prize, at the time Victoria's richest art prize, for a self-portrait entitled Four Tens (Pl 107); and the following year he took out Geelong's McPhillimy Prize for Dahlias (Pl 101).

One of the most remarkable aspects of Shore's achievements is that they were based on such limited experience of contemporary painting in other parts of the world. Not only did he never travel overseas; he had not left Victoria until his first trip to Sydney in 1940. He had, however, established contacts with Sydney by joining and exhibiting with that city's Contemporary Group from 1933, and the Society of Artists from 1936.

Although the sales from these Sydney exhibitions do not appear to have been particularly encouraging², Shore chose to mount his second one-man show there in 1937. Only four works were sold, but two of those were destined for prestigious collections - Gold and Silver was bought by Howard Hinton and another Banksias was presented to the

- 1 Shore's sales book lists Roses as being sold from the 1937 TMP show, but the catalogue of that exhibition includes no painting of that name, and Burdett in his review of the exhibition made no mention of it. The Group 12 show, however, did include a Roses on which Burdett commented favourably.
- 2 For the years before 1937, the sales book mentions only one sale made from a Sydney show - Banksias from the 1936 Society of Artists exhibition - and that was sold to Mrs R.G. Casey who was already the owner of more than one of Shore's works.

Brisbane Gallery by its purchaser. Over the next ten years, Shore held two of his six one-man exhibitions in Sydney, the last of these while he was living there with Grandy Lemann's family.

By the late thirties Shore had become a regular contributor to several annual group exhibitions. Apart from the two Sydney societies and the Twenty Melbourne Painters, Shore continued to exhibit with Group 12 (which he had established at the Bourke Street school during Bell's absence) when he left the school. This group held its last exhibition in June 1938. Two months earlier, Shore had participated in the inaugural exhibition in Sydney of the Australian Academy of Art and was to continue exhibiting with that body. In 1940 he became a member of the selection committee.

His acceptance of membership in the Academy widened the gap between Shore and Bell, who had established the Contemporary Art Society in opposition to the principles of the Academy. Group 12 consisted principally of students of the Bell school. Shore's participation in the 1938 Group 12 show, despite his part in forming the group, probably rankled with Bell, and it is not surprising that it was thereafter disbanded.

At the beginning of 1939 Shore moved to a new studio in Davis Avenue, South Yarra. Shore makes no mention of the reason for this move in any of the autobiographies, and the only reference to it is a brief entry in one of

his scrapbooks.¹ As he moved to Macedon within a few days of occupying this new studio, the most likely explanation is that he could no longer justify maintaining a large studio in Melbourne. It is reasonable to conclude that the new studio was smaller and cheaper, and was intended as a base from which Shore could operate when in Melbourne. Certainly little, if any, work was done in it.

The move to Macedon was undertaken after due deliberation and with some caution. The seeds of Shore's desire to live in the country had been sown in 1937 when he first spent a week at Macedon with Grandy Lemann. A three-week visit in the middle of the following year (shortly after his mother's death) produced enough work to stock his third one-man exhibition in August 1938. This was his most successful exhibition to that time, and the proceeds helped him to make the decision to leave Melbourne.

The 'indefinite period' at Macedon extended to an eight year stay. After four months Shore was sufficiently entrenched to relinquish the Davis Avenue studio, and the outbreak of war in September did nothing to make him regret his move. Throughout their time at Macedon, Shore and Grandy stayed in adjoining rooms at the guest house, Nandi, which they had used during their holidays in 1937 and 1938.

1 In a summary of his career at the front of his first scrapbook, the first entry for 1939 is "New studio - Davis Ave., S.Y.," followed by "16/1/39 - moved to Nandi for indefinite period."

Despite his reduced income from sales (supplemented by fees from occasional lectures given at provincial galleries and elsewhere¹), he does not seem to have had any financial difficulties either during or immediately after the Macedon period. His mother had left him the Union Street house, which he had promptly sold for £300, and this, together with the proceeds from the successful years 1937 and 1938, provided a sound financial foundation for the Macedon venture. His needs, beyond the oil paints he used so lavishly, were few. He smoked a pipe, but drank very little, and the tariff at the guest house was only two or three pounds a week. There is no reason to suppose, as has been suggested by more than one of Shore's acquaintances, that he was supported financially by Grandy Lemann during the years at Macedon.

Notwithstanding the war which they spanned, those years were contented and uneventful for Shore. He rarely visited Melbourne, and then usually only for day trips. One of the few occasions on which he was forced to stay away from Grandy overnight arose when he was summoned to Melbourne in March 1942 for a medical examination for military service. Shore's account of the anguish they both felt at this short separation reads melodramatically,

1 Shore gave his first lecture at the NGV, at Daryl Lindsay's request, in 1937. The scrapbook summary of his career also lists lectures given in subsequent years at the Geelong and Bendigo Galleries. There exists a carefully prepared set of notes for the Geelong lecture (now in Mrs Shore's possession). In 1943 he gave his "first lecture at Clyde school, Woodend" (suggesting a series of lectures was given), and just after the war he prepared a series of lectures to be broadcast by the ABC. After moving to Sydney in 1947, he also undertook a lecture series to country centres for the AGNSW.

but indicates the depth of their mutual devotion.¹ He was rejected at the examination not, he believed, on medical grounds, but because the examining doctor remembered his name from a list of artists offering their services for the war effort.

By the beginning of 1947, Grandy's health had deteriorated markedly. Her son suggested that she and Shore move to Sydney to stay with him and his family; the invitation included two airline tickets to Sydney. With nothing to tie either of them to Melbourne, Shore and Grandy accepted with some misgivings and moved to Sydney in February 1947. The new situation was far from ideal. Although the Lemanns had a large house at Turramurra, the household already consisted of Grandy's son, his wife and four children, his wife's mother and her sister; Shore and Grandy brought the total to ten. Both grandmothers needed daily professional nursing care.

Shore was given a small downstairs room as a studio-bedroom. He managed to make occasional painting trips, but soon began bitterly to regret leaving the idyllic conditions at Macedon. He was asked by the director of the AGNSW to conduct lecture tours in country centres, and on returning from one of these² he discovered that

- 1 AMSB, pp127-8. There were other occasions on which Shore stayed overnight in Melbourne; he mentions staying with the Stormonts in Springvale on some of them (AMSB, p144). Presumably it was the possibility of Shore's acceptance for military service which made this separation especially painful.
- 2 The first lecture tour, to Goulburn, took place in May 1947, and this trip, the second, was in July. He also travelled to Glen Innes in October and Wollongong in November.

the younger Mrs Lemann had rebelled at the situation, demanding that both the invalids be placed in nursing homes and that their companions find alternative accommodation.

A suitable nursing home was found for Grandy, but Shore did not immediately leave the Lemann home. He was still living there when news arrived of her death, some weeks after her daughter-in-law's ultimatum.¹ He was, by this time, suffering another bout of depression so severe that his brother Charles was contacted. He removed Arnold to the home of his sister Ida, who lived on the other side of the city. His painting equipment and most of his personal belongings remained at the Lemanns' in Turramurra and was not sent for until 1949.

Arnold admitted to Charles that he had attempted suicide, and now knew that he was unable to take his own life. Whether this referred to a recent attempt or to those of the mid-twenties is not made clear in Shore's manuscript (AMSB, p134), but Charles reacted by calling a doctor who committed Arnold to Barry Hall, a hospital for mental

1 Grandy Lemann died in September 1947. In 1963 Shore wrote that it took "a few weeks of searching" to find an acceptable nursing home, and "I cannot tell now whether it was but a few days or a few weeks" later that Grandy died, AMSB, pp132-3. In his manuscript (AMSB is the only autobiographical manuscript dealing with events after 1940), Shore is particularly vague concerning dates in 1947. In the summary in his first scrapbook, he gives July as the start of his breakdown, presumably coinciding with the decision to move Grandy to a nursing home. Arnold had been well received by the Lemanns when he arrived in Sydney. They had met him at Macedon on several occasions, and had purchased paintings of his. He continued to correspond with them after his return to Melbourne, and he and his wife, shortly after their marriage, stayed with the Lemanns in Sydney for a few days.

cases, where he underwent shock therapy. He found the shock treatment a great help in lifting his depression, temporarily, but also found, as he had done after his earlier breakdown, that his memory became impaired.

Shore stayed with his sister in Sydney until December 1947 leading what he called "a purposeless existence." (AMSB, p136) He did no painting in Sydney after Grandy's death, but did complete the series of lectures for the AGNSW. A Melbourne friend wrote to Shore advising him to return, and offering him a bed. Shore accepted, and stayed with this friend from the time of his return in December 1947 until moving to Springvale at the beginning of 1949.¹

1948 was a difficult year for Shore, but it must have been no less so for the family of his accommodating friend. Shore's state of mind did not improve throughout 1948. His friend Daryl Lindsay, then director of the NGV, had arranged for Shore to be appointed a part-time guide-lecturer at the Gallery, but he felt unsuited to the position and generally useless.

Guide lecturing seemed abhorrent to me . . . but what else could I do? . . . Time and again, at the National

1 The friend is nowhere identified beyond Shore's description of him as deaf and having a wife and family (AMSB, p137). However, Shore's address is given in the catalogue of the 1948 TMP exhibition (he did not exhibit) as 16 Westley St., Hawthorn, and this address was registered under the name of Alfred B. Howie. Howie is mentioned several times in the sales book. He was given a landscape in 1939, and between 1940 and 1946 bought four more Shores. In the career summary in Shore's first scrapbook there is an entry: "Dec. 1948 Left Camberwell to live at Springvale." This probably refers to the Westley Street address, which is only two streets away from Camberwell and within easy walking distance of the large Camberwell shopping centre.

Gallery, I would waylay Daryl, and try to convince him that I was a failure. (AMSB, pl39)

He still had no desire to paint. Twice during the year he attempted suicide.¹

The break came when he was invited to spend a week over Christmas 1948 with the Stormonts, an elderly couple who had been friends of Grandy's. Their property at Springvale, some seventeen kilometres from the city, was described by Shore as "a green haven of peace formed by some six acres of garden and pine forest." (AMSB, ppl43-4) At the end of the week Shore asked the Stormonts if he could live with them for a few months, and they agreed. His depression lifted, and the desire to paint returned; but he decided that painting would not be possible in his new situation because Mrs Stormont would not understand his need for isolation.

In March 1949, at Daryl Lindsay's request, he accompanied a British Council exhibition of British artists' work to Broken Hill as a lecturer. While there he completed a few crayon and pastel drawings of mines and miners, and so eased himself back into his work. In May he moved to a room in East Melbourne directly opposite the home of Daryl and Joan Lindsay. The Lindsays, who had staunchly supported him since the early thirties, extended their beneficence to allowing Shore to use a room above their garage as a studio. Shore at last sent for

1 Once by injecting nicotine weed killer into his arm with a hypodermic needle, and once by swallowing a paste containing white lead. (AMSB, pl40)

his painting equipment, which had been stored at Turramurra since mid-1947.

By September 1949 Shore had produced enough work, and mustered enough confidence, to mount an exhibition at the Melbourne Book Club Gallery. The show included works from Macedon, Sydney and Broken Hill as well as those completed in the new studio. Reviews were generally complimentary while suggesting that there had been little change in Shore's work since his previous Melbourne exhibition in 1946. Only two sales were made, but one of those, a watercolour of Old Workings, Broken Hill (Pl 143), was selected by Ursula Hoff for the NGV collection.

Still cherishing fond memories of his years with Grandy Lemann, Shore decided to marry. He realised, however, that the income from his part-time job was insufficient to support a wife. A timely offer of the position of art critic for the Melbourne Argus was made in October 1949. Shore believed he could combine this comfortably with his guide-lecturing, and his first review for the Argus was published on November 5. By December he was engaged to Agnes Scott, the daughter of a couple who had befriended him at Macedon. They married on February 22, 1950.

Agnes, thirteen years younger than Arnold, did not accord with his unrealistic notions of the perfect wife. She was a music teacher and a fine cellist, and had no intention of forsaking her professional interests and friends. He had married principally for companionship

and comfort, and particularly resented the fact that her cello playing often took her out in the evenings. He had not allowed for the different attitudes of, on the one hand, an elderly lady, with few outside interests, flattered and surprised by the attentions of a younger man, and, on the other, a talented and independent woman at the peak of her career.

After their marriage Arnold and Agnes rented a flat in Powlett Street, East Melbourne for a short period, then moved to another flat in Hawthorn. Shore was busy with professional commitments. Apart from his guide-lecturing and his reviewing with the Argus, he was required on several occasions throughout 1950 to accompany travelling loan exhibitions to country centres for the NGV. He also gave a series of lectures for the Council of Adult Education, and was asked to act as a judge for a number of art prizes, including two which required that he travel to Sydney.¹ His wife accompanied him on the first trip to Sydney, two months after their marriage, and it was on this occasion that they stayed with the Lemanns for a few days.

After eighteen months of marriage, Shore fell prey to another fit of depression. Consultations with a psychiatrist were of no assistance and he was eventually committed to a psychiatric ward at the Royal Melbourne Hospital for twenty-five days during October and November 1951. Here he underwent further shock therapy, which he

1 The AGNSW Travelling Scholarship in April 1950, and the Commonwealth Jubilee Art Prize in August 1951.

again found of benefit, but the lapses of memory noticed after the earlier treatment were more serious this time:

When I resumed lecturing at the National Gallery, I could not remember the names of artists and their paintings, both of which I had known for years. (AMSB, p155)

One compensation which Shore attributed to the shock therapy was that shortly after his release from hospital his wife became pregnant. A son, Malcolm, was born on August 21, 1952.

The forthcoming birth prompted the Shores to buy a house in Chrystobel Crescent, Hawthorn. They moved to the new home in April 1952, and Shore lived there until shortly before his death; it is still occupied by his widow. The year following Malcolm's birth was one of Shore's happiest. The time spent with his family and on an increasing number of outside commitments allowed only limited opportunities for painting.

In addition to his duties at the NGV and the Argus, Shore had agreed, early in 1952, to write a weekly full-page article for the popular magazine Australasian Post. The first of these was published in February 1952, and the last almost exactly two years later.¹ The burden

1 A common theme and format was used for nearly all the articles. A painting by an Australian artist was reproduced in colours which bore little resemblance to the original, using a registration process which often rendered the subject matter all but unrecognizable. In the accompanying article Shore outlined, in the simplest possible terms, the artist's aims and the author's reasons for considering the work worthy of inclusion in the series. This was filled out with biographical details and (continued next page)

of these regular commitments did not prevent him from also accepting, in the same year, a nomination to the Board of Examiners for the Victorian Education Department's Diploma of Art, and an invitation to give a series of lectures in the Fine Arts department at Melbourne University.

A letter to Nellie Lowther shows Shore's attitude to the Post articles:

You haven't taken me to task re any "Post" articles lately. You must have had some shocks. I'm "playing ball" along the lines of seeking contact with the general public who prefer sensation to art - not pandering exactly - trying to penetrate by one means if not another - a hopeless task probably.¹

The obvious attraction of the Post assignments was that he was given a free hand in his choice of subject, and sufficient space to do it justice.

In his newspaper reviews he faced the problem common to all critics of having to temper personal prejudices while reviewing exhibitions of all styles and standards.

1 (Cont. from previous page) occasional personal reminiscences. Shore made a point of featuring less well known artists as well as the few household names: in the first three months, artists covered included Drysdale and Nolan, but also Frank Andrews, Duncan Goldfinch and Dorothy Thornhill. The publishers' commendable, if heavy-handed, attempt to bring culture to the masses, at a time when the arts received very little media coverage, was rewarded by reader response sufficiently good to justify the series' continuation for two full years.

1 Letter, Shore to Nellie Lowther, dated 24/9/52 (apparently unsent), in Shore's correspondence file in the possession of Mrs Shore.

In general he followed the circumspect tradition established by most Melbourne reviewers before him of giving guarded and qualified praise to those whose works accorded with his own tastes, and writing as little as possible about the remainder. John Hetherington could label as understatement Shore's comment of 1962 that "I don't think I have any strong enemies among Australian painters."¹ On the other hand, nor could he have claimed to have exerted any great influence, as a critic, on the public's perceptions and attitudes.

By the beginning of 1954 the sense of contentment - even fulfilment - which had followed his son's birth had dissipated. Another bout of depression was treated with more shock therapy, this time without hospitalization. "Once again," Shore wrote, "there was the sequence of relative recovery etc. At this time I was painting only spasmodically, and certainly not at my best." (AMSB, p157) Very little work from 1954 is known², and most of the few examples from 1955 and 1956 are slight crayon and watercolour sketches. During these years even his scrapbooks, meticulously maintained until then, and continued from 1957, were neglected.

Despite his mental state, Shore continued to carry out his duties at the NGV and the Argus. In May 1954 he was

- 1 Hetherington, J., 'Arnold Shore: Painter's Brush and Critic's Pen', in Australian Painters, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1963, p67.
- 2 Three works dated 1954 were included in the 1957 retrospective exhibition at the Australian Galleries but none of these has been traced. No other work from 1954 has been found.

told that his services with the Argus were no longer required, but he was reinstated the following month and remained with the paper until it closed down. At the Gallery, Daryl Lindsay continued to be supportive. After he was replaced by Eric Westbrook in 1956, the new director was sufficiently satisfied with Shore's work to offer him the curatorship of Australian art. Shore declined, on the grounds that the position would have involved more time than he was prepared to give.

Only a few weeks after the closure of the Argus in February 1957, he was offered the position of art critic with the Age, at ten guineas a week. The Age offer came while Shore was hospitalized for further shock treatment, but the position was held open for him for a month. On the weekend following his release from hospital, Jock Frater and their mutual friend Bill Millane took Shore on a painting expedition to Smith's Creek.¹ The success of this trip can be judged from Shore's decision a few days later to accept the position at the Age, but to resign from the Gallery in order "to devote as much time to painting as possible."²

From this time Shore's output increased dramatically. Regular painting trips were made with Frater and Millane, particularly to Airey's Inlet where Bill Millane had a holiday house, and to the surrounding coastal regions. Shore felt sufficiently recovered from his depression

1 While in hospital Shore had begun to keep a diary (now in Mrs Shore's possession) which gives precise dates for the events of this period.

2 Diary entry, April 2, 1957.

to write a letter to the Age extolling the virtues of the Royal Melbourne Hospital's electro-convulsive therapy¹ - but again the cure was only temporary.

In July 1957 the newly opened Australian Galleries mounted the first major retrospective of Shore's work. Most of the paintings from his early years, thirty of them dating from before the war, had been borrowed from private collections and were not for sale, but from the more recent works on offer, sales were good. The NGV bought two important works - Bella Donna (Pl 74) and Reverie (Pl 106) from the beginning and end respectively of the Bourke Street school period.

Shore described it as "my most successful exhibition by far, up to date." (AMSB, p162) He could have been referring to both sales and reviews, because for the first time his role as a precursor of Australian post-war developments was recognized by some critics.

In 1949 Shore had rejoined the Victorian Artists' Society, and was shortly thereafter made a council member. In 1959 he became acting president for a few months, and was then elected president for 1960 and 1961. On his retirement as president after his second term, the Society awarded him its Medallion of Honour to make him only the fourth artist to be so honoured.

The period of his presidency of the VAS was not one of great productivity, but this owed less to the work

1 Age, May 2, 1957. The letter read, in part: "I have been changed from a state of active depression to one of renewed interest in life and creative purpose."

entailed in that office than to the renewed onset of depression. Following the revitalization of the late fifties, Shore's output dropped sharply in the early sixties to the extent that only three works are known to have been painted in 1961.¹ A new drug recommended by his sister-in-law early in 1962, however, brought a change which Shore was to describe as miraculous.² Within a few days he was painting more enthusiastically than ever, and 1962, the last full year of his life, was to be the most productive of his career.³

This last period of his life, though busy, was not happy.⁴ His erratic and unpredictable behaviour had driven his wife to leave him early in 1962, taking their son. They remained in constant contact, but were never again to live together as a family. Shortly after the completion of his last autobiography, Shore bought and moved to a smaller house a few streets away in Melville Street, Hawthorn, to enable Agnes and Malcolm to return to the house in Chrystobel Crescent.

- 1 In AMSB, Shore mentions indirectly a period of complete inactivity at about this time ("Had I been able to resume painting I might have found new thought," AMSB, pl69), but the date and duration of this period is not clear. The lack of works from 1961 and the large number dated 1962 strongly suggest that it occupied much of 1961.
- 2 AMSB, pl69 and again on pl70.
- 3 In the exhibition 'The Later Work of Arnold Shore' at the Powell Street Gallery in April-May 1977, of 41 dated oils from the years 1957 to 1963, no fewer than 22 bore the date 1962. This proportion is consistent with all the known works of Shore's last few years.
- 4 He continued to write the Age reviews until his death, "though the ordeal of finding something to write about shows [about] which I felt I had already written everything I could write, was torturing." (AMSB, pl69)

It was in this smaller house, while taking the very hot bath which it was his custom to take each morning, that Arnold Shore suffered a heart attack and died on May 22, 1963.

The paintings of his last few years, from 1957, are those of a man who has found the most potent way of expressing his emotions. The techniques which he developed in the thirties and brought to fruition in the forties are utilised more confidently in later years to exorcise aggressions and frustrations - and to record occasional peaceful interludes.

It is significant that his periods of depression were usually periods of artistic inactivity. The emotions bottled up for the first half of his life by a repressive upbringing surfaced in one of two ways - the degrading bouts of mental depression, or the sometimes tortured, often lyrical, always richly honest paintings.

CHAPTER TWO
THE EARLY YEARS - 1912-1923

The earliest artistic influences to which Shore was exposed were those of the stained-glass designers at Brooks Robinson. The relationship between Arnold and his father was too remote to suggest that they ever discussed art, even in terms of John Shore's wood-carving, and no other member of the family displayed any artistic talent. When he was interviewed by John Hetherington in 1962¹, Shore could recall doing no painting or drawing during his years at Prahran West state school, and there is no mention in his autobiographies of any other event or contact during his childhood which could have stimulated an interest in art.

Certain aspects of stained-glass design could be expected to emerge in its craftsmen's paintings: a strong sense of composition with a tendency to simplification of detail, a preference for clear, glowing colours, and possibly a linear rather than a painterly style. None of these is particularly evident in Shore's earliest known works - three oil sketches datable to c.1915 (Plates 1, 2, 3). Painting was treated as relaxation both from his designing work and from the tediously repetitive drawings he was required to produce at the National Gallery school. If his colleagues at Brooks Robinson had any influence on Shore's painting, it was not through their stained-glass work.

1 In preparation for Hetherington's article on Shore in his Australian Painters of 1963.

At least three of his close associates also painted outside working hours. Little is known of the work of Horace Picking or Hal Rooney¹, but several of Frater's paintings from this period exist. Shore was almost certainly familiar with Frater's work, if only through those of his pictures exhibited at the Victorian Artists' Society. In addition he could easily have visited Frater's studio during a lunch hour (his Gallery classes would have prevented him from doing so after work) as Frater's address is given in the catalogue of the 1915 V.A.S. annual exhibition as St James Buildings, Bourke Street, only a short distance from Brooks Robinson.²

Little of Frater's influence, however, can be seen in Shore's three early oil sketches. In each of them he has used a restricted palette with a leaning towards blue tones. In the two landscapes in particular, the pigments are muddied, the forms blurred and amorphous, in an excessively zealous

- 1 Picking was a member of the V.A.S., first exhibiting in 1914. He enlisted, and did not show works again until 1919, when he appeared in the catalogue as Pte A.H.Picking, M.M.,(A.I.F.). A work of his was shown in the exhibition of Australian art held at the Spring Gardens Gallery in London in 1925. It was Picking who recommended to Shore that he enrol at the Gallery school. Rooney accompanied Shore when he first visited Meldrum's studio in 1917, and subsequently joined Meldrum's classes. He also exhibited with the V.A.S., but only once, in the Spring exhibition of 1918. This was the last show in which Shore participated (before rejoining in 1949) and Rooney presumably left with Shore.
- 2 Frater first exhibited with the V.A.S. in 1913, giving his address as 8 Wellington Parade, East Melbourne. This casts doubt on Frater's statement (made in an interview with Laurence Course in 1970) that he returned to Australia early in 1914, although it is conceivable that he forwarded works for exhibition from Scotland to a friend at that address. No address is given for him in the catalogues of 1914 or 1916.

attempt to avoid harsh contrasts - Hall's dicta, learned second-hand, and applied by an untutored brush.

The recalcitrant paint has been dragged laboriously across the surface to produce sketches lacking vitality and interest. In Prince's Bridge (Pl 1), the tree and riverbank in the foreground show no more life than the lowering city beyond the sluggish river. In Trees and Vista (Pl 2), the desolate hulks of two gums sit squarely in a featureless landscape. This work can be compared with Frater's similar composition Eltham (Pl 4).¹ Although Frater's palette is as limited as Shore's, there is a luminosity and a delicacy of application, especially in the foliage but also in the impasto foreground, totally lacking in Shore's work.

Shore had no formal tuition in painting until 1917 when he joined Meldrum's classes. He is listed as a student in the drawing class at the National Gallery school for each of the years from 1912 to 1917, but never joined the painting class. The probable reason for this was the connection seen by his mother between drawing and designing; she would not have given her permission for Arnold to enrol in the painting class as it would not have advanced his trade work.

Shore would certainly have been familiar with the work being produced in the Gallery painting school. The end-of-year exhibitions brought together work produced in all of the school's classes. More importantly, he would have discussed techniques with John Rowell during their painting excursions

1 This work is dated 1914 on the reverse; this has been crossed out and replaced by 1910, all in Frater's hand. In style, however, it is closer to Frater's works of 1914-16 than to those he completed during his first visit of 1910-11. It may be one of two Eltham landscapes exhibited by Frater in the 1915 V.A.S. show.

to Ringwood, and no doubt watched his friend at work. Trees and Vista may have resulted from one of the weekend trips with the Rowells. It is clearly painted from a point some distance from the city, and Shore doesn't suggest that the trips were discontinued after he graduated to oil paints.

The works most admired by John Rowell and Shore at the time of their painting together were the landscapes of Royal Academician Sir Alfred East "and others of that ilk. We stewed over their works, and did our best to emulate their imagined worthiness." (AMSA, p7) East had published in 1906 The Art of Landscape Painting in Oil Colour, copiously illustrated with his own works in colour and black-and-white. It is almost certainly this book which Shore and his friends used as a reference; a copy was held in the State Library, then housed in the same building as the National Gallery.

There is, however, little of East's influence to be seen in either of the landscape sketches. East's works were typically idyllic pastoral scenes, with mammoth trees in full foliage dwarfing one or two tiny figures (Plates 5, 6). Detail was carefully and naturalistically recorded. The loose handling of the brushwork in Prince's Bridge is quite unlike East's technique, and the only similarity between Trees and Vista and the English artist's work is the inclusion of a mistily painted distant mountain range; certainly the stark gums which feature so prominently have no counterpart in East's paeans to nature's bounty. While undistinguished as works of art, these early sketches indicate an interest on Shore's part in French impressionism (as seen in black-and-white reproductions) and a willingness to accept the unidealized local landscape as suitable subject matter.

Shortly before leaving the Gallery school, Shore was nominated for membership of the Victorian Artists' Society.¹ He first exhibited with the Society in the annual exhibition of 1917, entering four works², of which two sold. One, an oil study of pink roses, was bought by the art dealer W.H.Gill; the other, a watercolour of a stone crusher in an old quarry, went to the watercolourist M.J.MacNally. The second of these, entitled Evening, Burnley and priced at three guineas, was inspired by "some of J.M.W.Turner's blue and gold watercolours." (AMSA, p10) It has not been possible to trace either of these works.

Max Meldrum was president of the V.A.S. in 1916 and 1917, which alone would have been sufficient to attract the attention of the new member. However, compared with that of "our leading painters - Streeton, Roberts and the rest - Meldrum's work seemed heavy and somber, and curiously mannered in technique." (AMSA, p38) It was with no intention of taking lessons from him that Shore first went to Meldrum's studio (see p23), but after their second visit both he and Hal Rooney were determined to become pupils.

Shore's strongest impression from his first brief talk with Meldrum was the breadth of his knowledge and experience, and the extent of his own ignorance. The small, intense Scot

- 1 By either Frater or Picking. With the exception of Meldrum, whom he met through the Society, and Horace Brandt, whom he met in the twenties, they are the only 1917 members of the V.A.S. mentioned by Shore in his memoirs.
- 2 In FYSF, Shore writes that two out of three exhibits were sold, but the catalogue lists four works under his name. AMSA (p 10), generally more reliable than FYSF, also gives four as the number of exhibits.

had about him "the aura of Paris studios, and a cosmopolitanism utterly different from the stuffiness of the Gallery."¹

His words left Shore wondering what he had been learning at the Gallery for the last five years. It was Meldrum's rhetoric, at least as much as the painted results of his theories, that attracted Shore.

The first class was held on a Saturday afternoon in September 1917. When Shore first approached him, Meldrum was not running classes, but demand for them was sufficient to attract about twenty would-be students to a meeting arranged by Meldrum.² At this meeting arrangements for a series of evening and Saturday afternoon classes were made. The fees agreed to by Meldrum were, according to Shore, "very moderate" but still "about three times the fee we had paid at the Gallery." (AMSA, p43) A life class, favoured by the majority of the students, was firmly ruled out by Meldrum - his principles could more thoroughly be learned from still life studies.

Shore has described in detail the process by which a Meldrum student achieved his results. The canvas was placed close to the subject (usually a still life or plaster cast), but the student was not permitted to look at the subject from this position; he must view it through half-closed eyes from some twenty feet away, then move forward to the canvas and record the visual impressions he had received at a distance. After several trips backwards and forwards, the painted canvas

1 Shore quoted in Hetherington, op.cit., p70

2 Shore mentions only one meeting in his autobiography, but in his scrapbook, beneath a photograph of several of Meldrum's students, he states that the "first and second meetings prior to Max Meldrum starting his classes in Melbourne were held at Hardware Chambers on 7th and 11th September, 1917."

would bear a remarkable resemblance to the subject,
 "provided the result was examined with half closed eyes from
 a distance."¹

It was the universality of Meldrum's theory - the means
 it provided for any student to produce a satisfactory likeness
 - that convinced Shore, and presumably the other students,
 of its veracity. "We rapidly felt that there could be no
 other truly scientific method of painting." (AMSA, p43)
 The near-mechanical uniformity of the students' work was
 confused with scientific precision, which in turn was
 erroneously assumed to be a pre-requisite for, or at least
 one of the features of, great art. Meldrum's continued
 insistence on the scientific nature of his theory at a time
 when the mystique of Science was at its height - when science
 and technology were manifesting themselves in advanced
 weaponry profoundly affecting the entire western world -
 confirmed his students' belief in their methods.

Although Shore's mature paintings, with their brilliant
 colours, appear to be the antithesis of the dark, colourless
 productions of Meldrum's studio, much that Meldrum taught
 him continued to assert itself in Shore's later painting.
 Shore acknowledged Meldrum's importance when he wrote that
 contact with him "changed the whole course of my life and
 study." (AMSA, p10) Meldrum contended that he taught his

1 AMSA, p43. Humphrey McQueen's version - that Meldrum
 "insisted that his work be viewed upside down, at a distance
 of twenty metres, with eyes half closed and through dark
 glasses" (The Black Swan of Trespass, p107) - is an
 exaggeration on several counts, but not a gross distortion
 of the devices used in the execution of his works and those
 of his students. Geoff Jones has given a similar account
 of the activities of students of the Meldrumite Justus
 Jorgensen, in Eagle and Minchin, op.cit., p52. Jones makes
 the further point that the work was done under electric
 lights to maintain constant lighting effects.

students how to observe, rather than how to paint; reproduction of the accurately observed tones of a subject would automatically result in an accurate likeness.¹ Close observation of tone and its accurate rendition remained a concern of Shore's throughout his career.

One theory propounded by Meldrum was that it would be all but impossible to understand or control more than five differences of tone, from light to dark, on any one object. In application this theory would preclude any attempt on an artist's part to show, for instance, continuous tonal gradations for a rounded surface. To illustrate this 'five tone limit' theory, Meldrum produced some portraits which, if Shore's description is to be accepted, may have been the first works painted in Australia to display cubist influences.

The students referred to these studies as 'hack-outs', because they suggested "something hacked out in cubistic surfaces in arbitrary fashion." Shore continues:

Cubism was of course unknown to us at that time. It was long afterwards that I noticed a certain resemblance between some of these portraits and cubist portraits by Picasso. (AMSA, p45)

Meldrum was awarded the NGV Travelling Scholarship in 1899, and spent the next thirteen years in Paris. He would certainly have seen and discussed cubist works and, while cubist theories were at odds with his own², he was capable

- 1 Meldrum, M., 'The Invariable Truths of Depictive Art', in Colahan, C. (ed.), Max Meldrum, His Art and Views, Melb., 1917.
- 2 In particular with respect to the relative importance of the eye and the intellect. Gleizes and Metzinger wrote in Cubism (1912) of Courbet: "Unaware of the fact that in order to display a true relation we must be ready to sacrifice a thousand apparent truths, he accepted, without the slightest intellectual control, all that his retina presented to him. He did not suspect that the visible world can become the real world only by the operation of the intellect."

of appropriating those elements of cubist practice which he could utilize in expounding his own principles.

However diluted was the cubist influence in these expository studies of Meldrum's, they did not find favour with Shore or (he implies) the other students. Even after he had enthusiastically espoused 'modernism', Shore could not accept Picasso (see p139). Meldrum's experiments must have seemed like aberrations to his new disciple, still ignorant of the name of Cézanne.

Soon after the classes began, Meldrum allowed the students to introduce colour into their works, but only that colour visible through half-closed eyes from the viewing position, twenty feet from the subject. Shore objected less to the restriction on the use of colour than to Meldrum's methods of lightening and darkening that colour - white must be added to lighten a hue; black or brown to reduce its intensity. As the addition of white reduces brilliance, and as black dirties the colour, "a consequent travesty of colour usually resulted."¹

These quibbles with Meldrum's practices were not sufficient to dim his students' enthusiasm. "We were Meldrumites to the death," Shore wrote. (AMSA, p46) The number of Meldrumites steadily increased; a day class, with higher fees, was opened in addition to the night and weekend classes. As the size and dedication of the group increased, contact with other

1 AMSA, p46. This was written twenty years later, when Shore had revelled in the exuberant use of pure pigment and established himself as an outstanding colourist. His disapproval at the time may not have been felt so strongly.

students and artists declined. There was no outside demand for Meldrumesque works. Exhibitions of the students' work drew some critical attention, but little of it was enthusiastic. One was either with, or against, Meldrum.

For the exhibitions, student paintings were framed in plain wood, painted black, intensifying their uniformity of appearance. The only exceptions were those by Meldrum himself; these were larger and were displayed in discreet gold frames.

The students disagreed among themselves on certain aspects of Meldrum's teachings, but these disputes were seldom referred to the master, who tended to dismiss them as irrelevant. The narrowness of Meldrum's approach caused Shore some disquiet, and this led to friendly arguments with Colin Colahan, one of the most competent of those who remained staunchly loyal to their teacher. Meldrum integrated other arts, principally music and literature, into his lessons, which "compensated greatly for the lack of emotional satisfaction with our painting." (AMSA, p47)

Shore's earliest known work from the Meldrum period, if we are to accept his own dating, is a self-portrait (Pl 7). When it was shown in the 1957 retrospective exhibition at the Australian Galleries, Shore dated the portrait to 1917-18. Mr John Farmer, however, bought it after his marriage in 1921 from a Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition - probably that of 1923. Shore did not exhibit with the TMP before 1923. In that year his entries included two self-portraits, and no other self-portrait is mentioned in any other TMP catalogue of the twenties. 1923 has also been suggested by John Farmer as the most likely year of purchase.¹

1 In an interview with the author, December 2, 1981.

It is therefore almost certain that this work was the self-portrait offered in the 1923 exhibition for fifty guineas. The other self-portrait in that exhibition was illustrated in the catalogue, and was not for sale. The only doubt concerning this identification is the price, which is very high for such a small painting. Farmer had known Shore since their student days, had joined him and the Rowells on some of their painting excursions, and was a fellow member of the TMP; he would not have been asked to pay that price. The price may simply have reflected Shore's satisfaction with the painting, and a reluctance to part with it - a reluctance which would have been tempered by the prospect of its going to an old friend and fellow artist.

Certainly the painting was exhibited as late as August 1923, but it may have been painted some years earlier. Its dating will be considered later, in conjunction with the other self-portrait from the 1923 TMP show.

The only other work known from Shore's early Meldrum period is Mandarins (Pl 9), now in London in the possession of Dr Ursula Hoff. When this painting was included in the 1957 retrospective exhibition, Shore gave it a date of 1918-19. Dr Hoff describes it as being "in the Meldrum tonal manner, but more sensitively handled than is usual in that school."¹ Mandarins is more highly keyed than most works from Meldrum's studio at that time, being set against a light background which allows interest to be added to an uninspiring subject through the use of dramatically dark shadows.

1 In a letter to the author, January 5, 1981.

Shore has not adhered strictly to Meldrum's five-tone-limit edict; in the larger portion of mandarin, at least seven distinct tones can be discerned. The transitions from one tone to another, however, are quite abrupt, in the Meldrum tradition. Shore was to retain, with little variation, this method of building up a solid of approximately spherical shape by accentuating the planes of its surface. It can be seen clearly in the detail of the Art Gallery of South Australia's Still Life (Pl 125), painted some twenty years after Mandarins.

Despite Meldrum's citing of Velazquez and Rembrandt as the supreme masters, his approach to the representation of solid objects owed as much to Cézanne, under whose pervasive influence he must have come, albeit unwittingly and indirectly, while in Paris. Although the problems they set themselves and the methods of solution they devised were expressed very differently, the results achieved by Cézanne and Meldrum had more in common than Meldrum would have cared to admit. His students were absorbing some of Cézanne's lessons, in a diluted and distorted form, before many of them had even heard his name.

During the years immediately following the war, Shore was as loyal to Meldrum as any of his students. Others of them - in particular Colin Colahan and Justus Jorgensen - are now seen as more firmly entrenched Meldrumites; but they lacked the imagination to be anything beyond Meldrum's disciples and copyists.¹ Although Shore spent more than

1 Frater, in a taped interview with Laurence Course in 1970, claimed that several of Meldrum's commissions were in fact painted by Colahan and Jorgensen.

five years under Meldrum, disappointingly few of his works from the period have survived, and only one of these can be dated accurately and reliably. The extant works give no indication of any major change in style through those years; but nor should we expect one from a staunch Meldrumite.

Nor were there any upheavals in Shore's personal life between 1917 and his father's death late in 1922. During the later part of the war, his manager at Brooks Robinson had encouraged him to branch into the design of stained-glass for church windows rather than the more prosaic leadlight designs for houses, hotels and shops; but Shore despised the "sentimental, pictorial stuff" he would then have been required to produce, and declined.

There was a more practical reason for his refusal: he considered himself too poor a draughtsman.

Such a state of affairs was a disgrace, after the years spent at the National Gallery school, but the disgrace was not wholly mine. We were not taught properly. No solid principles of drawing or design were ever offered to us. Then the Meldrum school experience added nothing better in this regard. Drawing had been pushed even further into the background. We were painters, we said. (AMSA, pp52-3)

After the war, a boom in the glass trade brought the firm so much work that Shore was no longer urged to diversify. His dissatisfaction with his draughtsmanship persisted, however, and was not to be assuaged until he received tuition from George Bell in the early thirties. It probably contributed to his enthusiasm for Meldrum's methods, the adoption of which rendered weaknesses in drawing largely irrelevant.

The numbers of Meldrum's students gradually dropped until, in 1922, they were insufficient to justify the large studio at 28 Bourke Street. The classes moved to a smaller studio at 9 Collins Street where Shore became an instructor in one of the evening classes. Meldrum himself visited this class only once a week. It is in teaching a theory that a devotee will most clearly see its flaws and limitations, and it was at this time that Shore began seriously to question the adequacy of Meldrum's teachings.

Two incidents in particular brought home to Shore the realization that Meldrum's theories did not provide the answers to all artistic problems. He had arranged, for one of his night class pupils, a still life combination of a highly polished black vase and a piece of pure white china. As Shore saw it,

the problem was how, with our tonal imitation theories, to represent the blackness and whiteness, and have any reserve left for the high lights. (AMSA, p60)

When Meldrum arrived, he immediately told the pupil to arrange another subject.

The second incident was the arrival of a postcard from Colin Colahan, touring in Switzerland, who wrote of the magnificent snow-covered mountains, but added that they could not be painted. Shore could picture the scene, and reasoned that it must be possible to record his visual impressions, but could see that the task was beyond Meldrum's methods. This inability to cope with subjects from the real world drew Shore to the conclusion that something was radically wrong with Meldrum's theory and practice.

Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this realization is that it took Shore five years to reach it, and some other disciples of Meldrum's longer still. Shore was to explain that in the light of subsequent experiences it is rather hard to believe that we fell so surely for such a theory, but it must be remembered that we were working, during the Gallery days, without any theory at all. (AMSA, pp43-4) It is testimony more to Meldrum's conviction and the power of his rhetoric than to the validity of his theories that his students believed he had shown them the one path to artistic greatness. His school was little short of a religious cult.

Shore's awareness of his own limitations, in particular his poor opinion of his own draughtsmanship, and the absence of any viable alternative guidance, no doubt contributed to his decision to stay with Meldrum as long as he did. Meldrum's methods, for all their inflexibility, did enable less talented (or under-confident) students to produce work which was sufficiently similar to the master's archetypes to satisfy him and themselves. To Shore, on his own admission always lacking confidence¹, Meldrum's theories provided a sheet-anchor which could only tentatively be released as maturity brought gradually increasing confidence and independence.

One work of Shore's from the late Meldrum period can be dated with some precision, from a reference in AMSA (p58):

1 He specifically refers at several points throughout the manuscripts to his shyness and lack of confidence, and this characteristic emerges strongly from his writing.

My father died just before the Christmas holidays.

I stayed at home for the whole period of my vacation, working fixedly at a still life study of a Chinese Figure. Shore's father died on December 30, 1922, placing Study of a Chinese Figure (Pl 10) in January 1923.¹ Shore's strong association of this work with his father's death suggests that he immersed himself in painting it as a form of escape from his grief. The meditative expression of the aged figure, and the sepulchral tones, may even suggest that Shore viewed the painting as a kind of funerary offering.

The work is larger than the usual Meldrum studio piece. It employs a severely restricted palette, the dark featureless background occupying most of the canvas. Only a single sliver of red lining relieves the sombre browns and greys of the figure and its robes. Less emphasis is placed on highlights than is common in a Meldrum school still life. The overall handling is cramped and overworked, even in the sections where the fall of the cloth calls for more generous sweeping strokes. There is evidence of considerable

1 There are minor discrepancies in the evidence. Shore's father did not die "just before the Christmas holidays", but Shore's recalled belief that he did probably explains the date of 1922 which he ascribed to the painting for the 1957 retrospective exhibition at the Australian Galleries. In both AMSA and AMSB Shore clearly states that Chinese Figure was painted in the aftermath of his father's death, and this fact is more likely to be accurately remembered than a precise date. AMSB also has it that Chinese Figure was painted in the backyard studio, raising the possibility that the additional room was built before Meldrum's school closed. Where discrepancies occur between AMSA and AMSB, however, it has been found that the later work, as could be expected, is the less reliable, and we can conclude that the study was painted, early in 1923, inside the house.

alteration and overpainting in the head of the figure in particular - the result of Shore's "working fixedly" on it.

Chinese Figure was the first work by Shore to be exhibited interstate and, after considerable furore, overseas. It was selected, along with a self-portrait of Shore's, for the 1923 exhibition of Australian art at Burlington House in London. Both works were exhibited in Sydney, but returned to Melbourne, and Chinese Figure made the trip to London only after George Bell and W.B.McInnes had forced the Sydney Society of Artists to send at least one work by each of the selected Victorian artists.¹

Meldrum's school limped on for about a year in the smaller studio before Meldrum was forced to close it. There was no other school to which Shore felt he could profitably transfer, and he considered the possibility of renting a private studio. His father was now dead, and his mother's craving for companionship influenced him instead to have a small room built in the backyard of their Windsor house.²

In this backyard studio, during the months following the closure of the school, Shore completed "a series of self-portraits and many still life and flower studies." He was

1 See p 172 for further details.

2 Although Shore's mother agreed to the construction of this room, and even contributed to its cost, she must have questioned Arnold's need for it. The house had in the past accommodated at least seven and now only she and Arnold lived there. A room was later found for Mrs Turton, the live-in companion; it should have been possible for Shore to adapt an existing room as a studio, especially as he would be using it only in the evenings and at weekends. He had already managed to complete some pictures at home, presumably in his own room. The early oil sketch Jug and Jar clearly pre-dates Meldrum's influence, but could not have been painted in the Gallery drawing class; and Study of a Chinese Figure had been painted at home early in 1923 (but see note 1, p 69).

still painting as a Meldrumite, but the first signs of breaking the bonds came "when I painted larger studies and stopped tramping backwards and forwards as I worked." (AMSA,p62) In turning away from Meldrum, however, Shore moved backwards into an academic realism which, in principle, he despised.

Frater and Shore were now in the habit of meeting each day at lunchtime. Following the withdrawal of, and from, Meldrum's influence, Shore began to rely more heavily on Frater's ideas. Frater's own art at this time, however, was as directionless as Shore's. To his own formal training in Glasgow, where his 'gods' were Velazquez and Manet¹, Frater had melded a touch of Corot, some of Meldrum's theories, and more than a smattering of the effects sought by popular Australian landscapists of the immediate post-war era (see p 89).

Little of Frater's work from the early twenties has survived. It will be argued in the next chapter that much of it was destroyed because it contradicted his version of the post-impressionist path he took from 1920. His landscapes had no great effect on Shore, who rarely attempted to paint out of doors during this period. However, a portrait of Frater's son Arthur (Pl 11), datable with some certainty to 1922-3², does bear similarities to one of Shore's self-portraits.

In Arthur, Frater uses a narrowly restricted palette for the sensitive young face emerging, now almost disembodied,

1 Frater in a taped interview with Laurence Course in 1970.

2 Arthur Frater, who was born in December 1916, owns the portrait of himself, and remembers that he was aged about six when it was painted. This is borne out by the sitter's appearance; he is certainly no younger than five, as a date of 1921 would imply, and from 1924 Frater moved away from the dark tonality of this work.

from a uniformly dark background. Bernard Smith has suggested that, with this work, Frater "reveals the beginnings of his interest in Cézanne."¹ It is an opinion difficult to justify. The planes of the face merge a little less smoothly into each other than they do in some of his earlier portraits, but the transitions between these planes are less abrupt than could be expected from Meldrum or one of his students.

It is, in fact, in the softening of these transitions that Frater's influence on Shore can most clearly be seen. Unfortunately no work of Shore's positively attributable to the period between the Meldrum school and the arrival of Orpen's Outline of Art issue on the post-impressionists has survived. However, the self-portrait illustrated in the catalogue of the 1923 Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition - Self Portrait with Tie (Pl 8)² - is almost certainly one of those from the series mentioned by Shore as being completed in that period.

So may be the self-portrait owned for many years by John Farmer and now in the Castlemaine Art Gallery (Pl 7), despite Shore's dating it to 1917-18. If this work was indeed completed in 1917-18, it is little wonder that Shore was enamoured of Meldrum's methods - they had transformed him from the plodding student of the three early oil sketches (Plates 1, 2, 3) to a forceful, assured artist in the course of a few months.³

1 Australian Painting, p193.

2 This title will be used to distinguish it from the self-portrait purchased by John Farmer.

3 The early sketches date from c1915, but Shore had no tuition in painting, and little time to experiment, between 1915 and his joining Meldrum's class in 1917.

Even if we accept the possibility of such a remarkably rapid artistic maturing, there are other grounds for preferring a date of c1923 for the Farmer self-portrait. There is no evidence that Meldrum allowed his students, in the studio, to attempt any subject other than still life. Although he included some of his own self-portraits in the exhibitions of his and his students' work, it is unlikely that his students would have been encouraged to attempt one. The genre does not lend itself readily to his method of constantly backing away from the subject. Although an experienced practitioner could adapt the method for self-portraiture, a student in his first year would be unlikely to do so.

Self-portraiture would also conflict with Meldrum's opposition to the intrusion of the artist's personality into a picture. Shore makes no mention in his writings of a self-portrait attempted during his time with Meldrum, but specifically mentions the series completed after his break with Meldrum, and the self-portrait later taken to show Frater.

The difference in appearance of the sitter in the two known portraits can be interpreted in two ways. The face in Self Portrait with Tie is more fully fleshed than that in the Farmer Self Portrait to an extent which can not be fully explained by differences in painting technique. In neither, however, is the sitter clearly older than in the other. It could be argued that the difference in fleshiness indicates a gap of several years between the two portraits, and that by this reasoning the Farmer portrait could be as early as 1918; it could as convincingly be suggested, however, that the thinner face is the older.

An alternative explanation is that the two portraits are separated by only a few months or even weeks, both being part of the series painted in the backyard studio in 1923. The change in Shore's appearance is explained in an extract from AMSA (p61):

Working at home in the evenings I thought I was fairly happy, but physical flabbiness resulted from lack of exercise, and mental flabbiness was not far behind. Physical exercise had never played a large part in Shore's life, but his existence would certainly be less hectic after the closure of Meldrum's school; he apparently taught the night class four or five nights a week after a full day's work at Brooks Robinson.¹

The Farmer self-portrait could then be dated to the period immediately following the closure of the school early in 1923, and Self Portrait with Tie from shortly before its exhibition in August of that year. The earlier work still shows very clearly Meldrum's influence. There is little interest in colour; tone is everything. Lighting has been chosen to bisect the face dramatically into light and dark halves and the five-tone-limit is comfortably obeyed. The shading has been achieved by applying the paint in an undisguised succession of parallel oblique lines, running from upper right to lower left, at rightangles to the direction of light falling on the face, in a manner reminiscent of shading in a pencil drawing.

1 This is suggested by his mention of Meldrum's "only visiting us once a week." (AMSA, p59) The Gallery night class required attendance on five evenings, so the class set up as an alternative probably did the same.

By comparison, even in the black-and-white reproduction, it can be seen that the contours of the face in Self Portrait with Tie have been modelled quite differently. The shadow under the chin merges gradually with the tones of the left cheek and a similarly smooth gradation traverses the right cheek. This contributes to the more fleshy appearance in this work, contrasting with the harshly faceted, bony structure of the younger face in the Farmer self-portrait.

But that the softening of the intersections of planes is not attributable solely to Shore's physical condition can be seen in the treatment of the sitter's jacket; there is little indication in the later work of the sharp-edged, sculptural effects which could be expected from a dedicated Meldrumite. The inspiration for this change in approach can be found in Frater's work and in that of the older masters to whom both Frater and Shore turned after Meldrum.

Self Portrait with Tie could be the work which Shore showed to Frater and Pat Harford at Yanckens (see p 26). Shore had been particularly satisfied with the portrait before Harford passed judgement on it; he had considered that it "showed a blend of Rembrandt, Raeburn and Meldrum." (FYSF) That these were the artists on whom Shore was modelling himself is significant, and that his implicit imitative eclecticism resulted in banal work is not surprising. Despite his disappointment at his friends' reception of the portrait, it would be natural to enter a work which he himself regarded so highly in his first TMP exhibition.

The comment by Harford which so devastated Shore was that the portrait was reminiscent of the work of the Hon. John Collier.¹ Self Portrait with Tie displays characteristics which suggest English portraiture of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century - the formal pose; a slightly arrogant, self-important expression; soft, uniform lighting minimising harsh contrasts in the face; a featureless background, the tones of which match the sitter's clothing. It is certainly easier to see Collier in it than any of Rembrandt, Raeburn or Meldrum.

On the other hand, there is evidence to suggest that Harford's comment was made as late as 1924.² Although this evidence rests solely and indirectly on passing comments of Shore's in his autobiographies, the fact that the implication is made in both FYSF and AMSA lends credence to the conclusion. If the 'Collier' portrait was painted in 1924 it suggests that Shore showed little progress in any direction during the latter half of 1923. This could be the period referred to by Shore in AMSA (p62):

A reaction [to Meldrum's teaching] came, not with flying colours and new thought, the years of [illegible word]

1 Collier had published The Art of Portrait Painting in 1905 when he was Vice President of the Society of Portrait Painters but, unlike East, resisted the temptation to include in it portraits of his own. The 1914 issue of Art Annual was devoted to his work, and both Harford and Shore could easily have seen a copy of this periodical in the State Library. Collier favoured historical subjects with a cast of scantily dressed women in the tradition of Alma-Tadema. Many of his portraits, especially of women, also have a touch of melodrama. His male portraits tend to be stolidly posed and painted, in a style which would have found favour with the Royal Academy (Pl 12).

2 In both FYSF and AMSA, Shore associates this incident with the arrival of the last few issues of the Outline of Art. See p 94 .

accepted domination were too long for that, my reaction was to lead to the doldrums. Nearly all incentive to paint diminished gradually.

This period of depressed inactivity was the first of several to punctuate Shore's career.

The Twenty Melbourne Painters group played a central, if passive, part in Shore's career by providing him with a platform for exhibiting the experimental works he produced during the 1920s. With its small membership, there was no need for a selection committee, and each member could exhibit up to seven works of his or her own choosing in the annual exhibition.¹ Had Shore remained with the much larger Victorian Artists' Society, he may have found it difficult to have his more innovative paintings accepted by the selection committee or, if selected, advantageously hung.

The Twenty Melbourne Painters was formed as an offshoot of the V.A.S. following a rift centring on Meldrum. Some V.A.S. members had ousted C.D. Richardson as president in 1916, installing Meldrum in his place. Meldrum's term was short; he was himself replaced in 1918 following an attempt by some of his supporters (including Shore) to take control of the Society. Meldrum resigned from the V.A.S., and Shore, Frater and several others followed suit a short time later.² Some of these renegade members then established the TMP group.

1 Although Frater had shown more than seven works in the first three exhibitions, both he and Shore kept rigidly to this limit from 1923, Shore's first year of membership.

2 Meldrum was not represented in the Spring exhibition of 1918, although both Shore and Frater participated.

Meldrum was asked to join, but declined. Shore demonstrated his allegiance to Meldrum by also refusing membership, but Frater, never as closely associated with Meldrum, became a foundation member.¹

The original members of the TMP had little in common. They were not fervid Meldrumites - his closest followers clung to their master and exhibited together in Meldrum students' shows.² A list of the original TMP members³, and the illustrations in the early catalogues, show that the society was no less steeped in tradition than the V.A.S. from which it had seceded. The society has survived largely unaltered to the present day: each of the twenty members contributes a number (usually seven) of competent but conservative realist works to the annual exhibition.

Membership of the TMP had no direct effect on Shore's painting. Most of the members were considerably older than he, but their respect for him was reflected in the choice of his self-portrait for illustration in the catalogue of the first exhibition in which he took part. Nor did Shore noticeably influence the other members of the society.

- 1 The events outlined in this paragraph have been reconstructed from a variety of sources including V.A.S. journals and catalogues, Shore's autobiographies, recorded interviews with Frater and a conversation with John Farmer.
- 2 Not all the exhibitors in these shows were students of Meldrum's. Some were independent artists sympathetic to his theories, one of these being Frater.
- 3 The twenty-three participants in the first exhibition were: Frater, James Anderson, A.M.E. Bale, Archibald and Amalie Colquhoun, George Colville, Carl Hampel, Polly Hurry, Richard McCann, A.E. Newbury, Clara Southern, Jo Sweatman, Ruth Sutherland, Isabel Tweddle, Dora Wilson; and Mr Fraser, Mrs Barlow, Mrs Gulliver, and Misses Downing, Edwell, James, Merfield and Walker.

Isabel Tweddle who, in the late twenties, joined forces with Shore and Frater in their stand against the reactionary forces which controlled art in Melbourne was a protégé of Frater's rather than of Shore's.

A.M.E.Bale, who gradually became the controlling figure of the Twenty Melbourne Painters, was inadvertently to provide excellent exposure for the work of Shore and Frater during the late twenties. Regular meetings of the society were held at her house in Kew. She appointed herself as an unofficial one-member hanging committee, and from 1927 she banished the unacceptably different exhibits of Shore and Frater to the west wall of the Athenaeum Gallery, the wall with the least favourable aspect.

Miss Bale felt that the work of Shore and Frater did not fit the tone of the majority of the exhibits. This annoyed Frater¹ - and presumably Shore - but in effect her decision provided them with a miniature annual exhibition of their own, as their exhibits, together with those of Horace Brandt and Isabel Tweddle were hung separately until the early 1930s.²

- 1 According to Alan Sumner, Frater's assistant at Yenckens at the time. Sumner carried some of Frater's paintings to the Athenaeum Gallery for the exhibitions. From a conversation with Sumner, July 19, 1980.
- 2 There is conflicting evidence on the arrangement for 1931. Blamire Young wrote in his review of the 1931 show: "Until this year the hanging committee has kept the two sections [conventional and experimentalists] apart; but this year the dividing line has disappeared and the walls are now common pasturage for all comers. It is better so." Herald, September 14, 1931, p11. However, Basil Burdett, in a review of art in Melbourne for the year 1931, wrote: "this year . . . the whole of the west wall was devoted to the work of Mrs Hunter Tweddle, Arnold Shore and W.Frater." Art in Australia, Series 3, No 42, February 1932, p10.

However, when Humphrey McQueen writes:

'Modernism', hitherto associated in the public mind with Sydney, broke into Melbourne's consciousness in 1931 when a small group with tenuous links dating back to 1913, commanded the whole of the west wall at the Society of Twenty Melbourne Painters' Annual Exhibition¹

he errs not only in the date of its introduction, but in his implication that the separation from the others was deliberate and militant on the part of the part of the few artists concerned.

Shore was no doubt grateful for the forum presented by the TMP exhibitions, but in turn was loyal to the society long after he had outgrown it, continuing to enter works in every exhibition until after the second world war.

Three of Shore's flower studies from the early twenties have survived. Blue Hydrangeas (Pl 13), in the collection of the Art Gallery of Western Australia, is inscribed on the reverse: "No 3679 Arnold Shore, 1921."² A work of Shore's with this title was entered in the Meldrum students' exhibition of May 1921. There is no reason to doubt the date of 1921, and it is reasonable to assume that the painting was among the Meldrum students' work exhibited in that year.

1 McQueen, op.cit., p22, probably using Burdett's article as his source.

2 The work is known to the author only through photographs, but the reported form of the inscription suggests that it is not in Shore's hand. The Art Gallery of Western Australia knows of no further evidence for a date of 1921. The information was presumably supplied by Shore.

In Blue Hydrangeas Shore shows himself to be a confirmed Meldrumite. The olive-green leaves, modelled in broad planes which conform to the five-tone-limit theory, emerge as if reluctantly from the uniformly dark background.¹ Using short, broad strokes of delicate pale blues, Shore has achieved a vibrant luminosity in the flowerheads which defies the surrounding gloom. In the few known works from this period, Shore manages, almost paradoxically, to employ the standard Meldrum methods, but to inject a vitality of his own.

The two other flowerpieces from the Meldrum period (Plates 14, 15) are similar to each other in many respects.² Both are strongly Meldrumesque in treatment, although showing rather more local colour than most still lifes produced in the school. Ranunculi (Pl 14) bears the date 1922, the accuracy of which there is no reason to doubt. Carnations and Irises (Pl 15) is sufficiently close in subject³, composition, style and palette to suggest a date very close to this.

These two works contain a hint of the vigour with which Shore was to imbue his later flower studies. It resides less in the blooms than in the stems and leaves, particularly

- 1 This effect has no doubt been intensified by the darkening with time of the darker tones.
- 2 Both paintings have proved difficult to photograph satisfactorily because of reflections from the waxed surface which Shore applied to the finished work. This treatment is mentioned in an inscription on the reverse of Carnations and Irises. (see Catalogue no. 23)
- 3 The same glass vase does not appear to have been used in both pictures, although the two vases are very similar in style. That neither appears in later flower studies suggests that they were properties of Meldrum's studio.

of Carnations and Irises, which makes an interesting comparison with the Irises in a Brown Jar (Pl 16) of 1924. These two paintings, separated by only two years, are vastly different in effect, the later Irises being one of the first of Shore's works to demonstrate his familiarity with post-impressionism. But the open composition which is such a striking feature of the 1924 painting is tentatively prefigured in Carnations and Irises, in which the more muted radiating tendrils lend a sense of controlled levitation to the arrangement - an impression not given by the self-contained solidity of most Meldrum still lifes.

The colour and movement which were to become so much a part of Shore's later works have their roots in his Meldrum period. Meldrum's teachings suppressed rather than encouraged their emergence, but glimpses can be caught beneath the dark Meldrumesque surfaces. Shore's natural colour sense was no doubt stimulated by the glowing colours of the stained glass with which he worked, and was strong enough to survive Meldrum's attempts to leach it from his students' canvases.

His years with Meldrum endowed Shore with three legacies. The first, directly taught, was increased power of observation; Meldrum showed his students how to look at the real world differently, and even if the new vision was blinkered, it had the virtue of objectivity. The danger, into which Shore did not fall, was that this method of seeing would permanently supplant a more subjective viewing, and render sterile work based solely on it.

The second, a direct but largely unintended result, was a firmer grasp of underlying form. It is impossible to observe and record with the veracity demanded by Meldrum's methods without simultaneously grasping, almost incidentally, an understanding of the physicality of the object being studied. This tacit interest in form brought Meldrum closer to Cézanne than he would have cared to acknowledge, and helped Shore to appreciate Cézanne's work when he first saw it in reproduction.

The third legacy, and in Shore's case perhaps not the least important, was the confidence gained from the self-discovered ability to produce a convincing likeness on canvas. This confidence enabled Shore to experiment, when he had left Meldrum, with a variety of alternative styles. If the earliest of these experiments led him back to the worn-out conventions of English Victorian painters, this was only a temporary side-track, entered without guidance. When, with his travelling companion Frater, he was introduced to the innovations of Cézanne, Van Gogh, Gauguin and Matisse, he was receptive to their influence, ready to experiment with their ideas, and prepared to withstand the opposition he would encounter.

CHAPTER THREE
POST-IMPRESSIONIST INFLUENCES - 1924-1929

It is in his stylistic development after 1923 that Shore's importance in the history of Australian art lies. He and Frater became purveyors of European ideas which had already revolutionized art throughout the rest of the Western world. Those in Melbourne to whom they tried to sell these ideas showed no interest at first, and only gradually and reluctantly accepted them. Had Shore and Frater not had the insight to discern their value, and the courage to pursue their own aims in the face of disinterest and hostility, acceptance of concepts already firmly established overseas may have been still longer delayed.

It will be the concern of this chapter to determine how these European influences reached Shore, and how he incorporated them into his painting. That we have only one of his paintings from 1924 and none from 1925¹ clearly presents difficulties in doing this, but this single work, Irises in a Brown Jar (Pl 16), dated 1924, is so markedly different from the works which can be ascribed to the early part of 1923 that the turning point in Shore's development can be placed with certainty in late 1923 or 1924.

Before considering the radical changes evidenced in Irises, it will be necessary to discredit the conflicting claim by Frater that his modernist period began as early as 1920. Shore and Frater were in such close contact during the early

1 Although Camellias (Pl 27) may be earlier than the 1926 date given it in Shore's scrapbook. See p107f.

twenties, especially in the months following the closure of the Meldrum school, that it is not tenable that one could have been influenced significantly by post-impressionism while the other remained virtually ignorant of its very existence.

In his interview with Laurence Course in 1970, Frater professed a knowledge of, and admiration for, Cézanne from as early as 1920. In the interview he mentioned Esmond Keogh (later Dr Keogh of the Anti Cancer Council), saying that his first contact with Cézanne was through reproductions brought back from overseas in 1919 or 1920 by Keogh in books. "From then on," Frater recalled, "I was his [Cézanne's] disciple."

Some ten years earlier, Frater gave a slightly different account in Daub:

In the early twenties a medical student, Corporal Keogh, machine gunner, A.I.F., returned with the returning Australian Army. I was painting his portrait in uniform, he was still not demobilised. He talked Cézanne, Matisse, El Greco etc. He brought with him several prints. After a couple of months, I accepted Cézanne and what was then called modern art.¹

In this extract, Frater at least admits that there was a delay (if only "a couple of months") between Keogh's showing him the reproductions and his own acceptance of their message.

Army records show that Keogh returned to Melbourne on HT 'Port Denison', arriving on May 10, 1919; he was discharged

1 Frater, W., 'Others Not So Heroic', Daub (The Victorian National Gallery School of Art Magazine), 1959-60, p18.

from the army on July 9, 1919.¹ This places Frater's discussions with Keogh in that two month period in the middle of 1919.² The portrait commission was the result of their mutual acquaintanceship with Pat Harford, Frater's assistant and Keogh's future brother-in-law. In his letter to Bernard Smith (see note 1, below), Keogh makes no mention of prints (which would have been difficult to transport) but remembers "a work on Modern Art by Charles Marriott" and books with reproductions of works by Nevinson and Picasso. There is no reason to doubt that Frater saw these reproductions shortly after Keogh's return. It does not necessarily follow that his work was strongly influenced by Cézanne from that time.

If the Marriott book was brought back from overseas in 1919, it must have been his Modern Art³, the only book on the subject published by Marriott before 1920. That book contains no reproduction by any of the major French post-impressionists, but concentrates on British artists of the period from 1900. The only references to post-impressionism are slighting, the most generous being: "with all its extravagancies, Post-Impressionism does point the general direction in which

- 1 Documented in a letter to the author from Central Army Records Office, dated April 21, 1981. In a letter to Bernard Smith (dated October 6, no year; in Professor Smith's possession), Keogh refers to books "brought back from England in 1918." This explains the date of 1918 given for Keogh's arrival in Australian Painting, p192.
- 2 If we accept Frater's statement that the portrait was painted before Keogh's demobilisation, as his posing in uniform would seem to substantiate. A Frater portrait of Keogh, probably this one, was exhibited not-for-sale in the TMP show of August 1921. It has not been possible to trace the portrait; although in 1970 Frater believed it still to be in Keogh's possession, the executors of Keogh's estate have no record of it.
- 3 Marriott, C., Modern Art, Colour Ltd., London, 1917.

painting will probably develop." (p17) Despite this, several of the illustrations do show strongly the influence of the post-impressionists and Matisse.

Another source which Frater claimed to have influenced him in the early twenties was the periodical The Dial. In conversations with Bernard Smith, he "expressed his indebtedness, prior to 1925, to colour illustrations of the work of Van Gogh, Matisse and Cézanne in copies of The Dial."¹ In fact, during the years 1920 to 1924 inclusive (there were no illustrations prior to 1920), The Dial reproduced no work by Cézanne, and only two by Van Gogh, both in black-and-white.² Matisse was better served, with one coloured reproduction (Woman with Goldfish, of 1911, in Vol LXXVI, May 1924, p391) and several black-and-white illustrations - but this hardly justifies Frater's "indebtedness". The issues of The Dial only cast further doubt on the veracity of Frater's later recollections of the period.³

It is possible that Frater saw Keogh's reproductions and those few in The Dial, was interested and impressed, mulled

1 Smith, Australian Painting, p194.

2 The original of one of these, Village of St Marie (Vol LXIX, Dec. 1920) is a black-and-white drawing; the other is the oil of c1888, L'Arlesienne (Vol LXXIV, Feb. 1923), which was reproduced again, this time in colour, in a later issue.

3 See also p 139 for the possible influence of The Dial on Shore, where it will be suggested that Frater was influenced by illustrations in The Dial after, not prior to, 1925.

over their implications for some time, and gradually and tentatively introduced post-impressionist elements into some of his paintings over the next few years. However, the only works of Frater's which can positively be dated to this period show little suggestion of the influence of Cézanne.¹

The portrait of his son Arthur (Pl 11) has already been considered. Another slightly earlier portrait, Light and Shade (Pl 17), was exhibited with the Twenty Melbourne Painters in 1920, and illustrated in the catalogue. It displays no signs of an interest in post-impressionism, but could conceivably have been painted at an earlier date and chosen for reproduction by the conservative TMP members. More conclusive is the appearance on the cover of the catalogue to Frater's 1923 one-man exhibition of Farm Landscape (Pl 18). Frater would have chosen, or at least approved the choice of, this picture for reproduction, strongly suggesting that it was painted in a style he favoured at the time of the exhibition in May 1923.

In Farm Landscape² Frater still treats his foliage in a manner reminiscent of Corot, and the blurred images of distant objects, the ambiguous expanse of grass in the foreground, the playing down of colour contrasts, and the importance of

1 There exist several other works, strongly redolent of Cézanne, which Frater retrospectively dated to the early twenties, but it will be argued that none of these could have been painted prior to 1924.

2 This title will be used for convenience. There was no work entitled 'Farm Landscape' in the 1923 show, but several of the seventy four exhibits had titles which could appropriately have been applied to this work. When sold from A.M.E.Bale's estate at Joel's in November 1981, it was entitled simply 'Landscape'.

the sky in the composition are not marks of a disciple of Cézanne's. Another landscape of Frater's, The Farm, known only through the sepia-toned photograph in the catalogue, was included in the Burlington House exhibition in 1923. Although the trees to the right of this picture appear to be painted in broad blocked strokes which could owe something to Cézanne, the remainder of the work, particularly in its low-horizoned composition, resembles most closely the popular landscapes of Harold Herbert, W.B.McInnes and M.J.MacNally.¹

In the Frater retrospective exhibition at the National Gallery of Victoria in 1966, five works were given dates in the early twenties. Arthur (Pl 11), which we have seen can be dated 1922-3, is quite unlike the other four (Plates 19, 20, 21, 22).

Three of the four are inscribed with a date: Adam and Eve (Pl 19) is dated 1922 on the paint surface in pencil; The Yarra at Alphington (Pl 20) is inscribed 1922 on its reverse side; and Olympus (Pl 21) is inscribed on the reverse "1921 W.Frater, To Nina 1951". The last of these inscriptions was clearly written many years after the painting was executed. James Mollison, to whom Adam and Eve was given by Frater, believes the artist may have dated the painting at the time of its presentation in the late sixties.²

1 Herbert and MacNally had been the joint subjects of a book published by Art in Australia in 1920; McInnes had achieved fame from his successes in the Archibald Prize, and had also won the Wynne Prize for landscape in 1918. Perhaps more pertinently, McInnes had travelled to Europe with Frater in 1911, and the two artists lived next door to each other in Lucerne Crescent, Alphington.

2 However, the signature is printed in the clumsy block-letter style favoured by Frater before 1935, and the date has been written with a pencil indistinguishable from that used for the signature. Mollison has now donated the painting to the ANG.

Little reliance, therefore, can be placed in these dates.

Several further points may be made regarding the dates: Tom Henderson, who arrived in Australia early in 1926 and worked extensively with Frater in the late twenties, could remember The Yarra at Alphington's being painted "a couple of years after I arrived here."¹ And Alan Sumner, who joined Yenckens in 1925 and accompanied Frater on many painting expeditions from that time, remembers Olympus' being painted in 1928, and The Yarra at Alphington a little earlier.² He has also placed Cattle Grazing, Yarra Valley (Pl 22) at c1930.

If the four works had indeed been painted at the times ascribed to them in the 1966 catalogue, we could expect to find them in Frater's 1923 one-man exhibition. They would certainly have been still in his possession, as each was given away or sold by Frater many years later. No titles in the 1923 exhibition correspond with the four titles used in 1966, nor could any of the 1923 titles reasonably apply to at least two of the works (Adam and Eve and Olympus). Nor is it even remotely likely, given Frater's lack of concern for public opinion, that he could have concealed these works and continued to paint and exhibit paintings in his pre-1920 style.

Most importantly, it is impossible to believe that these four works, with their obvious debts to Cézanne and their

1 In a conversation of July 8, 1980. Mr Henderson died in 1982.

2 In a conversation of July 19, 1980.

similarities to Frater's style of the thirties and forties, could have preceded the darkly Melodramatic Arthur and the innocuous harmonies of The Farm and Farm Landscape.

Brian Finemore, who organized the 1966 retrospective, was surely aware of the dating discrepancies, but could not dispute the dates which Frater put on his own works. Finemore, in a letter written two years after the exhibition to a Glasgow gallery curator, said:

As a fellow gallery man I would like to warn you that Mr Frater's recollections are extremely voluble but at times dubious as to their accuracy of dating.¹

Frater's memory regarding dates was demonstrably faulty. To cite only one instance, he insisted in his later years that he had painted The Red Hat in 1933, not 1937 as was traditionally believed.² However, he did not meet the sitter, Lina Bryans, until 1936.

Frater's retrospective backdating may have been quite innocent; he may genuinely have believed, in later years, that he had been painting in a Cézanne-influenced style in the early twenties. As there is no evidence for the more sinister interpretation - that he deliberately distorted the facts in an attempt to inflate his own importance in the development of modernism - he must be given the benefit of the doubt.³

1 Letter, Finemore to G. Buchanan, Curator of the Glasgow Museums and Art Galleries, November 19, 1968; in NGV files.

2 Frater changed the date in Dr Barry Reed's copy of Laurie Thomas' 200 Years of Australian Painting (Bay Books, 1971), explaining that "the Gallery's always had the wrong date on it."

3 Although Ruth Zubans and Basil Gilbert, of the Fine Arts department at Melbourne University, gained the impression
(Cont. over)

Further evidence belying Frater's version of events is provided by newspaper reviews. Some of these will be considered in more detail in a later chapter, where it will be shown that the works being exhibited by Frater in the period to 1924 could not have been of a contentious nature, even in the eyes of the conservative Melbourne reviewers. When their comments from these years are compared with the vituperative antagonism drawn from the same critics by later works such as The Drowsy Boy (Pl 23) of 1927, it becomes clear that Frater's paintings of the early twenties did not deviate significantly from the accepted conventions of Academic realism and the Australian landscape tradition.

The most probable explanation is that Frater saw Keogh's books in 1919 or 1920, and (possibly) some reproductions in The Dial and elsewhere, but was not yet ready to accept the implied tenets of post-impressionism. He did not appreciate their possibilities until exposed to them again with Shore, through the last few issues of Orpen's Outline of Art. Shore's response to the Orpen illustrations was so enthusiastic that Frater began to view them more seriously.

Frater, older by seven years, and with a much firmer grounding in the history, theory and practice of painting, was less easily swayed by the revelatory reproductions than Shore, who had had no opportunity to study European masterpieces except in reproduction. By the early twenties there was no longer the master-servant relationship which had existed between Frater and Shore at Brooks Robinson

3 (cont. from previous page) when they were interviewing Frater during the early 1970s that he was deliberately and maliciously 'playing games' with the dates of his early works, apparently finding some amusement in his ability to outwit art historians.

before the war, and Shore's evident excitement proved sufficiently infectious to induce Frater to embark, with his friend, on a course of experiment with post-impressionist styles.

It is true, as Frater claimed in 1970¹, that he helped to woo Shore away from Meldrumism; his open disagreements with Meldrum during class time fuelled Shore's doubts about Meldrum's omniscience, and he played a part in tempering the harsh tonal modelling employed by Shore until Meldrum's school closed. But in their development in the more positive and innovative direction indicated by French post-impressionism, Shore led the way.

Shore had no doubt that Orpen's Outline of Art series was the strongest single influence in his conversion to modernism. It will be worth considering in some detail the works which were reproduced in the last few issues, and the effect they had on his work. It is also important to establish when these issues could have reached Shore.

The Outline of Art series, for which Sir William Orpen allowed his name to be used although having very little to do with its preparation², was issued fortnightly in twenty-six parts during 1923 and 1924, at the end of which time the articles were combined and published as a book under the same title.³ Shore and Frater subscribed to the series,

1 Laurence Course interview, 1970.

2 Rothenstein, J., Modern English Painters I: Sickert to Smith, MacDonald and Jane's, London, 1976 (1952), p253.

3 The National Union Catalogue Pre-1956 Imprints, Vol 433, p198.

but the earliest time at which the third last issue (that covering French post-impressionism) could have reached them, allowing for shippage time to Melbourne, was well into 1924.

If Shore's account is to be accepted, the importance of this dating lies in the time limit it sets on the possible influence of French post-impressionism in his work. It also places Pat Harford's comparison of Shore's work to Collier's in 1924, if we accept the accuracy of this statement from AMSA (p68): "The publication [Outline of Art] was nearing the end when Pat Harford's devastating comment about my portrait burst my little bubble." In Forty Years Seek and Find Shore again connected Harford's comment with the arrival of the Outline of Art¹, and the profound impression this made on Shore lends credibility to all memories associated with it in his mind.

The extent of Shore's ignorance of post-impressionism is admitted in his next paragraph (AMSA, p68):

Talking about the "Outline" to Frater I confessed a puzzlement as to what the few remaining numbers would contain. Whistler and Manet had been reviewed, who else was there? To our narrow vision Art had ended with these men. We had a great surprise. The next number contained the work of Cézanne, Gauguin and Van Gogh, and other Post-Impressionist painters. It was as though a window had been thrown up in a stuffy room. These men were vital, their paintings alive in every sense of the word. And we had barely heard of them, had thought that Art stopped with Whistler and Manet!

1 Not, however, as precisely as in AMSA. Following his account of Harford's comparison, Shore writes: "Frater and I were at this time subscribing to a series of fortnightly issues of Orpen's 'Outline of Art'."

What had Shore and Frater been discussing at their lunchtime meetings? Apparently Frater had not been sufficiently impressed by the reproductions he had seen in Keogh's books and elsewhere to suggest that Shore search them out. Shore's use of 'we' in the passage just quoted suggests that, if Frater had already developed an enthusiasm for Cézanne's work, he had successfully hidden it from his friend.

The excitement which the Outline of Art reproductions aroused in Shore is transmitted in two written accounts in Forty Years Seek and Find and AMSA. Both are illuminating. The two versions also exemplify the differences in style, detail and immediacy between the two autobiographies:

Van Gogh thrilled me most. His use of line, his vigor, spirit, freedom from tonal imitation and copying were an inspiration. Very soon I tackled drawing flower pieces boldly in line, and colouring them to a conception of local colour. Large areas of mixed on the palette tone-colour were shunned; instead I allowed some of the components to show, so producing a vibrating chord. (FYSF)

And from AMSA (p69):

Van Gogh was really my first love among the moderns. A Matisse portrait attracted me mainly because of its use of line with oil paint. Here was something I had never thought about. I wondered whether it might not help me to overcome the frustrated state of mind resultant on the collapse of previously held theories and practice. Perhaps the use of line, a combination of drawing and painting, might permit the abandonment of slavish copying of tone values. A small flower piece served for the experiment. Flowers, foliage and all else in the picture,

were outlined boldly with a brush. Then the colours were painted within the outlines, special effects of light and shade being ignored while I sought to paint each colour as it appeared in average daylight.

The Matisse portrait mentioned by Shore was Head of a Woman (Pl 24), the only Matisse to be reproduced in the Outline. The two most striking aspects of the sepia-toned reproduction are the exaggerated angularity of the features, and the dark outlines which so impressed Shore. Van Gogh may have been his first love among the moderns, but it was Matisse and Gauguin who had the more radical and more immediate effect on Shore's painting.

The Van Goghs arguably lose more in reduction to sepia tone than any of the others. There is little indication of the vibrancy of the picture surface, or the thickness of the impasto. That Shore's work of the thirties, and throughout his career from that time, draws heavily on Van Gogh is undeniable; but his influence in the twenties is less evident, and in fact plays a subservient role to that of other post-impressionists and later artists.

By the early thirties, Shore had had opportunities to see high quality colour reproductions of Van Gogh's work. The works of the twenties do not display such a familiarity. They certainly give no indication of the discipleship to Van Gogh which has been assumed by many writers, and which Shore himself came to believe he had shown.

One aspect of Matisse's work which Shore could not appreciate was his use of distinctly unnatural colours - the feature which most clearly distinguishes the fauves from

the earlier post-impressionists. The only relevant colour reproduction in the Outline of Art was The Three Tahitians by Gauguin (Pl 25); all others were in black-and-white or sepia tones. While the colours of The Three Tahitians are bright and disposed in large flat areas, they are not unnatural. The predominant colour is the brown of sun-tanned bodies; the reds and blues could be accurate representations of the natives' clothes, and even the yellow background could truly reflect the colour of a tropical sky.

The last sentence of Shore's second quotation above shows two things: that he was prepared to experiment with broad, flat areas of paint more reminiscent of Gauguin than of the other post-impressionists; and that he could not yet recognize or accept deliberate distortions of colour. Hardly any mention of the use of unnatural colours was made in the text of the Outline; and even if more had been made of this aspect, it would have had little impact compared with a practical demonstration.

The other paintings reproduced in that issue were three Cézannes, two Van Goghs, another Gauguin, two Picassos in analytic cubist style and the futurist Balla's A Lady and her Dog. Shore later recalled that "a Cézanne riverscape" reminded him strongly of Meldrum's work, but conceded that if the Cézanne had not been reproduced in black-and-white, he may not have received that impression. (AMSA, p68) Shore was here referring to Landscape in Provence (Pl 26), the only Cézanne landscape reproduced in the Outline (the others were a self-portrait and a Card Players). He attributed the perceived similarity to Meldrum's landscapes principally to the shared technique of applying paint to the canvas "in a series of patches."

Some features of Frater's The Yarra at Alphington (Pl 20), already considered in relation to the date given it in the 1966 retrospective, invite comparison with this Cézanne landscape - in particular the simple lines of the buildings, viewed from a similar distance and at a similar angle of elevation, and the thin strip of sky across the top of the painting. The treatment of the foliage at either side of Frater's painting, however, points to a familiarity with further reproductions of Cézanne's work; a sense of volume has been achieved by setting broad diagonal strokes of colour at angles to one another, although the result lacks Cézanne's transparency and lightness.

Certainly Frater drew more from Cézanne than did Shore. However much doubt may be cast on Frater's accounts of Keogh's influence in the early twenties, it seems certain that he was exposed to some Cézanne reproductions at that time. Shore had probably seen nothing of Cézanne prior to the arrival of the Outline of Art issue, and the three of his works reproduced there gave little indication of the extent to which Cézanne had revolutionized the construction of form and space. Solely on the basis of the illustrations in the Outline, Shore could well have concluded that Cézanne was less radically innovative than Van Gogh, Gauguin or Matisse.

In the Matisse reproduction which so impressed Shore (Pl 24), modelling in the face and neck is limited to a few simple planes; in Gauguin's Two Tahitians (Pl 29), the modelling appears to be even more severely reduced, form being

indicated almost exclusively by subtle variations of outline. In the two Van Gogh reproductions, the clearly separated, parallel brushstrokes, seemingly applied with total disregard for tonal modulations, must have struck Shore most forcefully.

If his newly aroused interest had led Shore, whether at Frater's suggestion or not, to investigate current or back issues of overseas periodicals in the State Library, his appreciation of Cézanne would have remained unaffected. The Dial, it has already been stated, reproduced no work by Cézanne between 1920 and 1924; nor did the London based Colour. Both magazines, however, contained many illustrations which could have extended Shore's artistic horizons in other directions. The possible influence of these and other journals will be considered more fully later in this chapter.

The last two issues of the Outline of Art, which Shore, as a subscriber, undoubtedly saw, contained a varied collection of works by British war artists and British artists since the war. Their very variety, however, mitigated against their making any pronounced impact on Shore. The 'war artists' issue contained some interesting works - Wyndham Lewis' totally abstract Plan of Campaign, Sunrise: Inverness Copse by Paul Nash, and some tentatively cubist-influenced studies by C.R.W.Nevinson - but these were more advanced than Shore, just introduced to post-impressionism, could accept.

The order in which the reproductions were presented also tended to suggest that these were artistic aberrations produced by the war, and superseded by the more rational and traditional works in the last issue - works by such staunch

Academics as Orpen himself and Alphonse Legros, who had taught Frater at the Glasgow School of Art.

To return to Shore's description of his first experiment with modernism (see page 95): his approach consisted in outlining all details of his subject with a brush, then colouring the sections so formed as naturalistically as possible. He acknowledged the Matisse portrait (Pl 24) as his inspiration for this outlining technique. Sharp boundaries between planes of colour were a familiar feature of the work done by Meldrum and his students, but no artist in Australia to that time would consider stressing the outlines of a subject as Matisse has done in this head.

Drawing and painting were considered as separate arts, yet even in a conventional drawing the outlines of jaw and nose, so uncompromisingly stated by Matisse, would have been softened and blended into the adjacent areas of flesh. Shore could not immediately assimilate the starkness of these black lines into his own work. The painting which most fully incorporates them is Back Yard Idyll (Pl 32), painted some three years later in a style which Shore was subsequently to disclaim as too derivative of Matisse.

For a considerable time - possibly as long as two years - Shore was to experiment only tentatively with firm outlines. The earliest known work in which they appear prominently is Camellias (Pl 27), the appearance of which at the 1926 TMP exhibition prompted the Argus critic to complain that the outlines gave the forms "an unpleasant character that is foreign to oil paint."¹

1 Argus, September 14, 1926, p13.

It was this emphasis on outline and the renunciation of tonal modelling which most clearly set Shore's work apart from that of his contemporaries, and which particularly aroused the antipathy of reviewers. If Matisse, through his Head of a Woman, was the principal instigator, the two Gauguin reproductions in the Outline of Art must have added support to Shore's decision to experiment along these lines. In both (Plates 25, 29), outlines of the natives' bodies are firmly delineated, and little modelling is evident in the reproductions.

Shore continued to employ firmly painted outlines for many years. In his flowerpieces they were to become less pronounced from 1930, but in the figure studies of the thirties, much of the modelling is suggested by outlines of varying thickness. This is particularly evident in Bella Donna (Pl 71) and another nude (Pl 73).

Of the small flowerpiece which constituted his first attempt with the new style, Shore wrote: "It was a clumsy job, but very heartening." (AMSA, p69) As this flower study was not, in his opinion, a satisfactory effort, Shore may well have painted over it. In FYSF he admitted to having destroyed most of the experimental paintings resulting from his earlier camping trips with the Rowells, and he continued to paint over works with which he was not quite satisfied - for instance, and most regrettably, the larve 1927 canvas Back Yard Idyll. He is most unlikely to have exhibited this flowerpiece; he and Frater showed only their best work with the Twenty Melbourne Painters (AMSA, p92), and at the time he had no other exhibiting outlet.

The only traceable flowerpiece from this time is Irises in a Brown Jar (Pl 16)¹, dated 1924. It could not be the painting whose execution was described by Shore. Far from being a 'clumsy job', it is painted with an assurance which suggests the culmination of a series of experiments rather than the first attempt. More conclusively, its 'foliage' has not been outlined, nor would these spindly leaves lend themselves to such an approach. But there is no doubt that much of it fits the technique he described. Some of the flowers' petals are outlined in neutral tones, if less completely than the written description suggests. Little attempt has been made to distinguish different tonal values in the petals.

The colours are still subdued by comparison with those of Gauguin or Van Gogh - but Shore had possibly still seen only the one coloured reproduction at this stage. The lightened palette still marks a distinct break from the earlier Meldrumesque work. The vase and table-top are painted in broad, vigorous strokes, but without the thick impasto in which Shore was later to delight. It is in the frond-like green leaves, radiating exultantly from the centre of the canvas, that Shore most manifestly gives vent to his new sense of freedom.

He has clearly not felt constrained to present a precise representation of the scene confronting him. Some of the strands of dull green have indeterminate beginnings and

1 This was the title given to the work when it was catalogued for Leonard Joel's May 1980 sale. The painting was subsequently withdrawn from auction and sold to its present owner.

ends, and exist principally to enhance the vigorous sense of life that the artist has captured. Before this time, Australian flower painters had attempted little more than the accurate representation of a harmonious floral arrangement. Delicacy and repose, rather than colour and vigour, were the attributes sought after by both artists and collectors. Many of the most highly regarded flower painters were women, some of whom painted little else¹, and in the minds of some male artists there may still have attached to flower painting connotations of genteel amateurism, a legacy of a period when painting was considered an appropriate pastime for young ladies.

Flower painting had its more eminent practitioners, most notably Arthur Streeton and Hans Heysen, but then, as now, their flowerpieces received less favourable attention than their landscapes.² Heysen's flower studies tended to be over-crowded and over-fussy, with verisimilitude his principal aim. The prolific Ernest Buckmaster could bring more life to his flowerpieces than could Heysen, by virtue of a facile bravura which rendered them less stereotypic than his landscapes.

1 Among them Marian Ellis Rowan, Amy Vale and Violet McInnes. A.M.E. Bale painted a wider variety of subjects, but her flowerpieces were particularly praised (see extracts from TMP review, p 282).

2 Ann Galbally's Arthur Streeton (Lansdowne, 1969) contains only one reproduction of a flowerpiece. Several books on Heysen's work have been published, but all concentrate on his landscapes. A review of the works of both artists to have come onto the market in recent years indicates that flower studies constituted a larger proportion of their output than these publications would suggest.

Streeton's flower arrangements, usually of roses, were often presented as objects of worship, positioned as if on a draped altar. No incidental detail was allowed to detract from the serene beauty of the blooms. Streeton was arguably the finest flower painter in Australia to the early twenties - but there was little joy in his studies. Over the next few years, Shore transformed the art of flower painting. To a greater extent than any other Australian artist before or since, he could inject into a painting of flowers a vitality which truly expressed their origins - as if the plants continued to grow in, and out of, the vase in which they sat.

During the same period, Margaret Preston was to alter the conventional image of a flower study more radically than did Shore. Although similarities can be found in the work of Preston and Shore from the middle and late twenties - particularly in a penchant for broad, contrasting stripes, the use of firmly delineated outlines and broad areas of unmodulated colour and, where necessary, Cézannesque modelling - Preston's displays a leaning to the geometrical, bordering on the peripheries of cubism, not present in Shore's.

Preston had first-hand experience of modern European developments, and could have been expected to assimilate their influences more readily than Shore. Her work of the late twenties now appears more advanced than Shore's, but in his flowerpieces Shore retained a vitality which Preston partially sacrificed to modernism.

Interestingly, like Shore, Preston tempered her modernism during the early thirties to the extent that many of her works from that period appear more conventional than those of the late twenties. It is unlikely that Preston significantly influenced Shore. Little of her work was seen in Melbourne prior to the publication in December 1927 of the 'Margaret Preston Number' of Art in Australia¹, and the most striking similarities between the work of the two artists had emerged before that date.

In AMSA, Shore specifically mentions several other paintings which he completed in this first period of enthusiasm and experimentation, some of which are described in detail. One of these is a portrait of one of his nephews, about which he writes: "One flesh tint served for most of the face, lines were used to outline the features where necessary. The study had a positive liveliness." (AMSA, p69) This description suggests that the portrait, now lost², may have represented Shore's closest approach to the Matisse Head of a Woman. Even here, the qualifying 'where necessary' indicates that the outlines were not as striking a feature of the portrait as those in Matisse's work.

The nephew portrait was exhibited with the Twenty Melbourne Painters. Shore does not give the year, but

1 Series 3, No. 22, December 1927.

2 The logical recipient of this portrait would have been the nephew himself. The painting may be in the possession of the widow of one of Shore's brothers, who has chosen not to respond to several requests to view her collection of Shores.

quotes a critic as writing:

a puerile study of a boy's head was shown, by an artist who has demonstrated in the past, how much better he can paint. (AMSA, p69)

These precise words cannot be traced in any review of the period, but the sense is the same in the Age review of the 1926 exhibition:

Another artist who aspires to modernity [Frater's works had just been discussed] is Mr Arnold Shore, but he fails in most of his attempts as against many excellent flower paintings that he has done in recent years, and his portrait study is a puerile production.¹

The word 'puerile' is sufficient to suggest that this is the review from which Shore is quoting, from memory. The date of 1926, however, poses a problem to which we shall return.

Shore considered that his best work from this time was Camellias, which he sold to Adrian Lawlor, and which was subsequently destroyed when bushfires swept through Lawlor's house in 1939. Shore describes the painting in detail, and fortunately it is possible to identify it positively as one reproduced in the catalogue of the 1926 TMP exhibition (Pl 27). Shore's correspondence file contains a letter from Lawlor, dated December 3, 1926, offering £5 for Camellias from the Twenty Melbourne Painters show in September.

1 Age, September 14, 1926, p11.

Shore's description of Camellias provides interesting insight into his aims and techniques at this time, and is worth quoting in detail. It also adds colour to an important work now known only through a black-and-white photograph.

My best painting during this period was a study of Camellias. The bold red and white of the flowers, set in the glossy dark of their leaves, suited the new technique. The colours were applied richly to the canvas, with a few lines here and there to suggest character and modelling. The background, a pearly grey, was deliberately mixed on the surface of the canvas, so that the components of the grey were not entirely obliterated - I wanted a colour chord rather than a dead monotonous surface. For a semi-neutral piece of drapery which covered the table-top, I painted a rich green blue striped with brown. This was really letting myself go. A painter's Seventh Heaven blossomed about me. Liberation from servile copying had come. (AMSA, p70)

The precise dates of both these paintings - Camellias and the nephew portrait, which will be referred to as Ted, the only possible title from the 1926 show - are unclear. The position of their descriptions in the manuscript, following immediately Shore's account of his first experiment in the new style, suggests that they too were among his earliest ventures into modernism, placing them in 1924. This view is supported by the last three sentences quoted above, which

give the impression of describing a newly experienced sensation of freedom.

Casting doubt on a date of 1924, however, are the fact that they were not exhibited until 1926 and, in the case of Camellias, a further comment in AMSA (p70): "The picture soon found a purchaser - an enthusiastic friend, Adrian Lawlor wrote to me offering a fiver for it." This doubt hinges on the word 'soon'; but 'soon' could mean either 'soon after it was painted' or 'soon after it was first exhibited' in September 1926. We know that there was at least a three month delay between the exhibition and Lawlor's offer, which in itself renders Shore's 'soon' rather meaningless.

Two possible interpretations present themselves. The first is that Shore's paintings of 1924, 1925 and 1926 merge in his memory; that Camellias and Ted were painted shortly before the 1926 exhibition; that it took that period of two years for Shore finally to fling off the trappings of the early twenties and to experience the sense of "really letting myself go." The other is that these works were both done shortly after Shore's eyes were opened to the possibilities of post-impressionism, but were not exhibited until 1926.

A photograph of Camellias also appears in Shore's first scrapbook. Beneath the photograph Shore has written "Painted 1926 Bought by Adrian Lawlor, destroyed by 1939 bushfires." The inscription, however, appears to have been written in one sitting, which would place it at least thirteen years after the execution of the painting. Several other points about this scrapbook indicate that it was compiled at a later date, probably during Shore's years at

Macedon, from carefully collected cuttings, rather than as a continuous record of contemporary events. Years later Shore could easily have confused the year of execution with the year of exhibition and sale.

A key point in resolving this problem of dating is the timing of Shore's first breakdown. This breakdown was followed by a period of five months during which Shore did no painting - the result jointly of a general malaise and a decision to concentrate on his trade work. The period of depression and inactivity ended "towards Springtime . . . the trees in tree lined St Kilda Road were just breaking into leaf." (AMSA, pp78-80) Shore determined to start taking his mother on outings, and a short time later the desire to paint returned, encouraged by Frater's coaxing and the approach of the next Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition.

This places the start of the breakdown early in the year; that this year was no later than 1926 can be established indirectly but with some certainty. As related in Chapter 1, Shore soon extended his excursions with his mother to trips to the country, and a successful visit to Jo Sweatman at Warrandyte led to holidays at Warrandyte during the Christmas holidays and again the following Easter.

It was during the Easter holiday that Frater, not accompanying Shore this time, furthered his acquaintanceship with Horace Brandt. Frater had met Brandt previously, but did not know that he was an artist until meeting him on this occasion at Thallons the frame makers. Yet Brandt, under his mother's name of de Chimay, exhibited with the TMP in September 1927, no doubt at the invitation of Frater and Shore.

Shore's breakdown, then, occurred in 1925 or 1926. The first few paintings attempted after the breakdown were "valueless except as visible evidence of a start," and satisfaction with his work returned only gradually.¹ The TMP exhibition opened in mid-September in both 1925 and 1926. It is therefore highly unlikely that, in the short time available, he could have produced seven new works of a sufficiently high standard to fill his quota for the group's exhibition. He would be forced to have recourse to works painted prior to the breakdown, possibly even works previously exhibited, and there would consequently be little stylistic difference between his exhibits in this show and those of the previous year.

The reviews of the 1925 TMP exhibition made no particular mention of Shore (or Frater); it was in their reviews of the 1926 exhibition that Melbourne's critics began to unsheath the claws with which they were to attack Shore and Frater over the next few years. These reviews, which will be considered in more detail in Chapter 8, make it clear that the paintings shown by both artists in 1926 were markedly different from the work they had shown in earlier years.

This strongly suggests that Shore's five months of inactivity fell early in 1925 rather than 1926. We know that at least one of the 1925 exhibits - Long 'Un (No. 123) - was painted in a style not markedly different from that

¹ At his first attempt, Shore chose as his subject "the same flowers used for the first modern effort," out: "What a difference now! Bravado was entirely absent. Still in the grip of exaggerated scruples, daring or liveliness was forbidden." (AMSA, p83)

of the early twenties; together with Chinese Figure (Pl 10), it was cited in several reviews of Shore's 1929 one-man show as demonstrating his capacity in a more traditional style. The paintings shown in September 1926 would then have been separated by some eighteen months, and a complete revival of spirit, from those exhibited the year before.

Despite Shore's excitement at discovering post-impressionism, his home life during 1924 was stifling and miserable. It was almost to be expected that his enforced introspection and lack of outside activity would lead to some form of revolt. He also believed that his painting, in the few months following the arrival of the Outline of Art "showed no great improvement after the first spurt." (AMSA, p72; see also note 1, page 121.) Following his recovery from the bout of depression, however, he found himself (AMSA, p85)

in command of a new spirit. The breakdown was regarded as a blessing. Having been through it, I'd never lapse again, and it gave me an understanding of the troubles of others.

Indeed his numerous future 'lapses' were not to take place until after he had written these words during the second world war.

On the basis of the dating of the breakdown to early 1925, it becomes virtually certain that Camellias was not painted earlier than this, or it would have been included in the 1925 TMP show. We can now accept Shore's scrapbook

dating of 1926 and recognize in Camellias the result of two years of his struggling to assimilate the lessons of the artists he first encountered in the Outline of Art.

The influence of these masters can be seen in separate elements of Camellias, even in the black-and-white photograph (Pl 27). Shore has adopted the firm separate brushstrokes evident in Van Gogh's Self Portrait (Pl 28) for the leaves. The dark outlines of the Matisse and Gauguin reproductions (Plates 24, 25, 29) surround the vase and some of the petals.

Cézanne can be seen in Shore's lack of concern for a realistic representation of the physical relationships between vase and table, and between verticals and horizontals. This, however, could not have been learned from the Outline of Art reproductions, and nor could the bold and dramatic setting of dark foliage against pale background, or the tension and potential movement suggested by the dark stripes plunging off the edge of the table. Other reproductions of European work which Shore could have seen between 1924 and 1926 will be considered at the end of this chapter.

One other flowerpiece of Shore's from 1926 exists. Carnations (Pl 30), dated 1926, was sold from the estate of A.M.E. Bale in 1981. With this provenance it could be expected to have been exhibited with the TMP, but it can not be positively identified from any TMP catalogue.¹

1 The title Carnations has been given to the work by the author to distinguish it from numerous other flower studies. The canvas on the stretcher of the painting bears the inscription "Flowers Shore 1926" and it may well have been exhibited with this title. An exhibit entitled 'Flowers' was included in the 1926 TMP show.

Carnations falls stylistically between Irises (Pl 16) and Camellias (Pl 27). The palette is high keyed, but the brilliant colour contrasts detailed in Shore's description of Camellias are lacking. The colours of the striped material on which the vase rests match those of the flower stems, and this blued-green is repeated in a lighter tone on the wall panel to the left. The transparent vase, through which can be seen the lower ends of the stems, provides no break in this colour scheme; the sprinkling of pale pink flower heads blends with the soft peach colour of the decorative screen to produce a harmony of muted blues and pinks.

The feature which most clearly distinguishes this work from the earlier known flowerpieces is the thick impasto on the petals, a vitalizing device which Shore was to use consistently in future studies.

The importance placed on the decorated screen is new in Shore's work. The bird and the branch on which it sits almost become part of the floral arrangement. This interest in background detail, and the decision to allow the background to provide elements of interest in competition with the principal subject, probably derive from reproductions of works by Matisse and, possibly, members of the Bloomsbury group.

A survey of the periodicals which Shore was most likely to have seen by 1926 reveals no work which could, with confidence, be suggested as a direct stimulus to his new interest in background detail. Matisse was not strongly represented in this period, but in two reproduced

interiors¹, background elements are treated in as much detail as foreground figures - and Shore had already shown himself to be receptive to Matisse's innovations.

Nor were the Bloomsbury artists and their close associates given much space in the British periodicals available before the late twenties in Melbourne, but two Vanessa Bell still lifes and another by Frederick Porter² accord equal prominence both to the central vase and flowers and to surrounding effects.

Other examples by both Matisse and the Bloomsbury artists, particularly Duncan Grant, can be found bearing more striking resemblances to Shore's work of the middle to late twenties, but it is not possible to show conclusively that Shore had seen any of them. Other possible influences, in the form of reproductions, will be considered later in this chapter.

In 1926 (or 1927³) Shore was introduced, through Frater, to Horace Brandt. Shore was greatly impressed with the paintings they were shown when he and Frater first visited Brandt's flat. "They might have been straight from Paris," he wrote, "from some very modern, very well organized, art

1 Woman with Goldfish (Pl 34) in The Dial, May 1924, p391; and Interior in Artwork, October-December 1925, p18.

2 Vanessa Bell: Still Life in Colour, January 1924, p15; and 'Untitled Still Life' in Artwork, Summer 1926, p150. Frederick Porter: Still Life in Colour, March 1923, p41. Clive Bell included Porter, along with Vanessa Bell, Duncan Grant and Roger Fry, in a group of seven members of the London Artists' Association who, he suggested, could form the basis of a new English school; Bell, C., 'A Re-Formation of the English School', Artwork, 2:7, Summer 1926, p148.

3 Shore first visited Brandt's studio in the year following that in which his breakdown occurred; the dating of the breakdown has already been discussed at length. It is possible that Shore, like Frater, had known Brandt before this, but only as a passing acquaintance.

dealer's Salon." (AMSA, p89) The most distinctive impression gained by Shore was one of "a lovely sense of colour."

After Shore and Frater had visited him several times, Brandt offered to demonstrate his method of painting. Having laid a new canvas horizontally on a newspaper-covered table, Brandt "dabbed his brushes in the tins of colour, and rubbed and splodged on the canvas" for about twenty minutes. Shore and Frater were then instructed to view the result from the other end of the flat.

We looked, and kept on staring. It was really quite wonderful. From his apparently haphazard swipings and daubings had grown a delicate vision of a street scene . . . the tops of the buildings showed an effect of soft sunlight, one tower particularly catching the light which had turned it to a bronze. The sky was limpid.

We were amazed, and said so. (AMSA, p90)

Such an approach can be visualized in one of the few of Brandt's paintings to have survived. Flowerpiece (Pl 31) was in Shore's possession until his death, and so was almost certainly one of the paintings sent unsuccessfully to the Salon d'Automne in 1930. The assurance with which these impossibly brilliant colours are applied to build up an impossible edifice of flowers results paradoxically in a convincing image radiating energy.

Brandt never painted from nature (as exemplified in this work) and urged Shore and Frater to "be free" - to work only from their imaginations. According to Shore (AMSA, p91) he was slower to accept this advice, or be influenced by it, than Frater. Frater's experiments resulted in "some figure

compositions, good efforts too."¹ Shore continued to work from nature until he tried to paint, from memory, some studies of a circus which had visited Warrandyte during one of his holidays there. All but one of the circus studies was destroyed; the one remaining example is The Circus (Pl 37), now in the National Gallery of Victoria.

The Circus is dated 1929, but Brandt's influence can be seen as early as 1927 in the freedom of Back Yard Idyll (Pl 32), and more obviously in the treatment of the crowd in Ravel's Bolero (Pl 72) of 1931. These three works - Back Yard Idyll, The Circus and Ravel's Bolero - are arguably the high points of Shore's known oeuvre in their originality of conception and the breadth and freedom of their execution. As Brandt can be given much of the credit for freeing Shore's brush, palette and imagination, he must be seen, after Meldrum, as the single strongest local influence on Shore. Meldrum provided Shore with many of his basic painting skills, but Brandt inspired him to use them with originality.

No surviving work is known from 1927, but we have black-and-white photographs of two paintings Shore exhibited with the Twenty Melbourne Painters in that year. Back Yard Idyll was destroyed by the artist a few years after it was painted, but he still chose it as the frontispiece illustration for

1 One of these may be Olympus (Pl 21), the date of which, it has already been suggested, is c1928. It has clearly been painted from the imagination, with a vigour unusual for Frater at that time and reminiscent of Brandt. Olympus may be one of, or associated with, two works entitled 'Bathers' which Frater exhibited in the 1928 TMP show. At the time, neither Frater nor Shore had ready access to nude models, and the two 'Bathers' may well have been products of Frater's imagination. Shore did not paint a nude until late 1931; Frater, described by several of his acquaintances as parsimonious, is unlikely to have hired a model for his own use.

Forty Years Seek and Find, and Flowers was illustrated in the 1927 TMP catalogue (Pl 33).

Flowers exemplifies the outlining and filling-in procedure described by Shore as used in his earliest modernist experiments. By comparison with the earlier flower studies, Iris, Carnations and, to a lesser extent, Camellias, this work demonstrates a greater assurance deriving from increased familiarity with the new style. The dark outlines of the petals are more distinct and more consistently carried through than in the earlier works, where the outlines tend to merge into the petals.

No attempt is made to play down the dark mass of the vase, to make it subservient to the blooms; it becomes a focal point of the painting. The danger that this dark round shape, which firmly anchors the floating flowers to the table-top, would dominate the composition has been averted by two skilful devices. The first is the asymmetrical arrangement of the dark flower centres, each in itself a miniature focal point, causing the attention to be drawn upwards to dance around the bunch of flowers, and giving a sense of lightness and life. The second, and more unconventional, is the use of three bold verticals, taking the eye upwards and out of the painting.

One of the most striking differences between Flowers and the three earlier works is the treatment of straight lines. The stripes on the tablecloth in Camellias are hard-edged, these edges even being emphasized by sharp dark lines. The vertical corner between the walls, although softer, is also straight and clearly defined, as are the vertical bands in the backgrounds of Iris and Carnations. The three vertical

strips in Flowers are quite different. Their edges are blurred and ambiguous. They represent one further remove from realistic representation, and are unapologetically introduced purely for their effect on the composition.

Whereas the solid dark shadow in Carnations increases the sense of repose in the arrangement, the shadow on the wall in Flowers is painted as a series of short detached strokes, enhancing the impression of waving movement in the flowers by suggesting flickering patterns of light. The table-top is similarly treated, playing down its stark horizontality. This reduction in solidity may reflect the influence of Brandt, whose solid forms (to judge from his Flowerpiece and from Shore's description of his methods) were built up from a succession of rapidly applied dabs of paint.

This more vigorous and abandoned approach, having its origins in reproductions of fauvist works but stimulated by Shore's seeing at first hand Brandt's working methods, is seen to more striking effect in Back Yard Idyll (Pl 32). The setting is almost certainly the back yard of the Shore home in Windsor. The parrot was Shore's own.¹

This painting, in several ways, marks a distinct break from anything we have of Shore's from an earlier period. As colour was to become so important to him, it is particularly unfortunate that we know this work only in monotone. Some indication of the colour scheme, however, is provided by a facetious passage in the Bulletin's review of the show:

1 It accompanied Shore and his mother on at least some of their holidays to Warrandyte; Tom Henderson, who spent some time at Warrandyte with Frater and Shore, remembered being kept awake by the bird.

"Bah!" screamed the parrot in the yellow cage tied to the purple clothes line. "You people have nothing to complain of. I'm cursed with a natural sense of beauty, and just look at the back yard Mr Arnold Shore has put me in."
 "And as for me," said a burnt-siena tree with no roots, "I ask you!" . . . Then all the vorticist still-lives began to scream in tones of purple and scarlet, the parrot uttered crimson oaths and the small boy made half-suffocated green noises.¹

Despite the tone of this section, the reviewer then described Frater and Shore as the most interesting painters in the show, suggesting that their stained-glass work had led them to experiment with massed colours and simplification of form. "Some of their work appears to be deliberately ugly," he continued, "But more of it seems sincere, and all of it is exciting."

The subject matter and composition of Back Yard Idyll are extraordinary for the time. Exhibits in Twenty Melbourne Painters shows, and in all other group and individual exhibitions, fell simply into one of three categories: figure paintings (including portraits), landscape or still life. This painting is none of these. By conventional standards, the cage would be an unusual element in a still life, and would certainly not be allowed to dominate the composition as this one does. The rest of the picture is, in a sense, a landscape, but a far cry from the picturesque views chosen

1 Bulletin, September 15, 1927, p52.

The 'small boy' was probably Frater's son John, the subject of his exhibit The Drowsy Boy (Pl 23).

by traditional artists. There is a tree, to be sure, but a scrawny, ugly tree oppressed by, and subsidiary to, the lowly building behind the cage, and the implicitly more imposing house to the right, indicated only by its impersonal, somehow disdainful chimneys. The tawdriness of the scene is emphasized by the sagging clothes line supporting the cage, itself supported by a wooden prop slicing up through the composition.

Or is it intended to be a portrait of a favourite pet? Little wonder that the public had difficulty accepting the painting, and that the critics, with the one exception quoted above, perhaps prudently, ignored it. If they suspected that Shore was cocking a snook at all their cherished ideals and expectations, then the title should have convinced them. The signature, a single printed S, could be interpreted as a final contemptuous gesture on the artist's part.

Innovatory though the overall conception is, it is hardly more so than the style. This is especially evident in the tree; the trunk is delineated by two broad, sweeping strokes, and the branches have been painted with aggressive gestures which epitomise the struggle for survival in these unlovely surroundings. The foliage has been dashed in with a loaded brush to give an effect of vigorous life, matched by that of the thrusting growth in the lower right corner. Much of this section of the painting is reminiscent of the work of Matisse from the first decade of the century, and also raises the possibility of Shore's knowledge, through reproductions¹, of the work of Derain and Dufy.

1 Shore had probably also seen an original Dufy in the 1923 exhibition of European art shown in Melbourne. He had a copy of the catalogue in his library.

One of Shore's scrapbooks contains a photograph of Back Yard Idyll, with beneath it the intriguing words:

This destroyed later because it was a large canvas, for one thing, and I was hard up - I also thought it somewhat too Matisse.

This last comment can be interpreted in two ways. The first is that this particular painting was too directly derivative, Shore considering it one of his "attempts at originality [which] were only cribs from what I had seen."¹ The second is that at some later date, Shore decided that Matisse was not for him; or at least that Matisse's style was not to be allowed to influence his own to too great an extent.

The first of these possibilities seems less likely than the second. Although we cannot know exactly which Matisse reproductions Shore had seen, it is likely that they were not many by 1927. The central placement of a bowl of goldfishes in Woman with Goldfish (Pl 34)², which Shore had probably seen in an issue of The Dial (May 1924, p391), and other works of c1911, may have suggested to Shore the motif of his own pet parrot in its cage as the dominant feature of a composition. But the remainder of Back Yard Idyll is too original in conception and detail for Shore to have seen it

- 1 Shore wrote of the period following the arrival of ^{the} last of the Outline of Art issues (AMSA, p72): "Notwithstanding our excitement, partly because of it perhaps, my painting showed no great improvement after the first spurt. A chopping and changing period set in. Originality was desired, but I was like so many other painters caught by the thrill of Modernism, my attempts at originality were only cribs from what I had seen."
- 2 Also known as Sculpture and Goldfish, 1911, Whitney Collection, New York.

as a direct crib from Matisse. If direct influences on the subject matter are sought, they can be found in works by Picasso and Georg Kars which were reproduced in a 1927 issue of Artwork (see p 147).

It seems probable, then, that Shore, between the execution of the painting and its destruction, turned away from Matisse as a source of inspiration. How quickly did this reaction set in? The date of the destruction of Back Yard Idyll would give some indication, but that date is uncertain. Shore would not have been 'hard-up' until 1930 at the earliest when, at his own suggestion, he made an arrangement with the manager of Brooks Robinson to accept half-time work at half pay for a year.

The painting must have been still intact in 1929, and although it is not listed under that name in the catalogue of Shore's one-man exhibition in that year, there is an exhibit entitled The Parrot (No 2) which may have been the same work. The price of The Parrot - twenty guineas - indicates a large work; only one exhibit was more expensive. The same price was asked for Back Yard Idyll at the Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition in 1927. On the other hand, if the two paintings were in fact one, it is surprising that Shore, in the scrapbook entry mentioned above, describes it as having been exhibited with the TMP in 1927, but does not mention its being in his own one-man show. The name, too, has reverted in the scrapbook to Back Yard Idyll.

Even if Back Yard Idyll was exhibited as The Parrot in 1929, was given a prominent place in the catalogue, and was priced expensively, this does not necessarily indicate that

Shore still had a high opinion of it. By the time of the one-man exhibition, he had difficulty mustering enough works to fill the gallery, and would probably have included any available completed oil not already committed to the Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition to be held the following month.

Shore's extant works of 1929 and of the early thirties show to a far smaller extent the influence of Matisse and the fauves than Back Yard Idyll appears to do. This picture possibly marks the high-point of Shore's modernism. Had he continued in the direction it indicates, he may have had a more radical influence on developments in Australian art of the thirties. Instead he reverted to a more moderate, impressionist and post-impressionist based style, which probably facilitated his eventual acceptance by the public and critics. It is also possible that it was these critics, with their ridicule of his fauvist experiments, who drove Shore back into less adventurous channels.

Only one work from 1928 is known, but that one is sufficient evidence of another change in Shore's style. Red Camellias (Pl 35) is treated more loosely than earlier works, with forms being indicated allusively with broad, sweeping strokes. Large sections of the canvas, particularly the blue-toned panel in the upper right corner, have been quickly covered with a swirling backwards-and-forwards action which would previously have been reserved for underpainting. The painting has an

unfinished, sketch-like quality, but Shore has signed and dated it, strongly suggesting that it has been completed to his satisfaction. It is almost certainly the work entitled Red Camellias shown with the Twenty Melbourne Painters in 1928.¹

As in earlier flowerpieces, dark verticals have been used in the background to add rigidity to the composition, and to offset the curvilinear forms of the arrangement. The edges of verticals and horizontals, however, are blurred, resulting in a merging of planes in direct contrast to the sharp perpendicularity of the planes in Camellias (Pl 27) of two years earlier. Mottled shadows add to the overall unification of the separate elements in the picture.

Over the next few years, before joining Bell, Shore was to vacillate between the loose, freely-drawn approach of Red Camellias and a more firmly modelled style in which his training under Meldrum continued to assert itself. Of the possible sources for the broader, less formal style, two appear the most likely: reproductions of works by a variety of European artists as diverse as Forain and Spencer Gore (to be discussed later); and the two local artists with whom Shore was most closely associated, Brandt and Frater.

1 The painting is inscribed on the reverse:
 "Red Camellias Arnold Shore 1928." It was bequeathed to the Castlemaine Art Gallery by Miss D. Levigny in 1981. Shore's sales book records a "Camellias oil study 18 x 22 Bought by Miss D. Leviny [sic] Castlemaine Vic. 6 gns." The unframed measurements of the work under consideration (41.4 x 51.1 cm.) would become 18 x 22 inches with the addition of 2 cm. all round for a frame.

Brandt's influence has already been considered, and is difficult to analyse in further detail until more of his works are brought to light. Frater married Brandt's advice to his own admiration for Cézanne to produce a group of works during the late twenties which, though quite different in subject matter, display several similarities to Shore's work of this time.

The neutral yellow-greens and browns seen in the foreground of Red Camellias are close to those used by Frater in Olympus (Pl 21), and have similarly been applied with loose, vigorous strokes which leave untouched substantial sections of underpainting. The year of execution is probably the same for both paintings. The bravura of Shore's brushwork never quite matches that of the cross-hatched foreground of Olympus, although it approaches it in some works of the thirties. In the late twenties it is more closely linked to the techniques used by Frater in more peaceful landscapes - The Yarra at Alphington (Pl 20) and Landscape (Pl 36).

In the second of these, the broad strokes with a lightly loaded brush in the bottom right corner are particularly close in style to those in the foreground in Red Camellias, and the short vertical strokes used for vegetation in the fore- and middle-ground are reminiscent of a technique used by Shore in Back Yard Idyll. The swirling to-and-fro brushwork in the right panel of Red Camellias can also be seen in the water in Olympus and the sky in the other two Frater landscapes.

The imprecision of the datings, particularly of Frater's works, makes it impossible positively to identify the instigator of these stylistic devices. The cocky, extroverted Frater, however, appears to be capable of letting himself go more fully than Shore. Neither could fairly be called a theoretician, but Frater was a more instinctive painter than Shore, the avid reader and conscientious chronicler. That only some of Shore's works of the period show the exuberance and flair that characterize most of Frater's suggests that Shore was still unsure of the direction his art was, or should be, taking. On the other hand, in his finest works, Shore achieves a vigour and originality beyond anything of Frater's.

This variety in Shore's work is exemplified in the four known paintings from 1929. From this time Shore dated almost every work he completed, and each of these four is signed 'Shore 29'. The Circus (Pl 37), now in the National Gallery of Victoria, was probably completed early in the year. During one of Shore's holidays at Warrandyte, a small circus visited the town.

After the end of the holiday I essayed several circus studies from memory. There was a tang of the experience in the best of these studies, though all except one have since been destroyed. (AMSA, p 91)

The holiday would have been either at Christmas time, when all Brooks Robinson employees would be expected to take their holidays, or at Easter. The Circus is not the work of a man beset by the 'pre-exhibition paralysis' which Shore experienced in the months leading up to his one-man show

of August 1929, following his booking of the venue in February. On these admittedly tenuous grounds, The Circus can tentatively be assigned to January 1929.

Shore acknowledged The Circus to be one of his finest and most innovative works, privately claiming it to be the first modernist work painted in Melbourne.¹ By appropriately defining 'modernist' the claim could probably be justified - as several counter-claims could be justified under other definitions. There are certainly indications in The Circus of influences which are not evident in Shore's earlier work, but the conception and execution of the whole are Shore's own.

The brilliant green, dashed boldly onto the canvas with a palette knife (see detail, Pl 38) now suggests familiarity with Dufy or Derain, but it is doubtful whether an impression sufficiently vivid to inspire the circus rider's jacket could be conveyed through the illustrations available in periodicals of the time. Piper prints, with their more accurate colour reproduction, were not readily available until Gino Nibbi began to import them in 1930. We are forced to return to Horace Brandt as the most likely source of inspiration for Shore's lavish use of pure pigments.

The figure of the rider, and the horses she straddles, are produced with great economy of means, each form being constructed from a few strokes with a well-laden brush or knife. Shore's awareness of his limitations as a draughtsman have kept him from trying to show too much detail - the horse's lower limbs are lost in the dust of the ring;

1 It always hung in a prominent place in his home and was so described in his wife's hearing on more than one occasion.

the rider's hold on the horses is suggested only by her pose - but this endows the group with an inescapable sense of immediacy and movement. Tension in the rider's figure is conveyed through the rigidly parted legs converging on the glowing jacket with its central arrowhead of paint.

The impression of circular motion is rather more obviously suggested by the swirling dust currents rising to join the slope of the tent roof, by the continuing line of the fence enclosing the ring, and by the blurring of the faces in the audience; this motion is implicitly halted by the solid tent-pole, which also nicely balances the composition.

The central group relies more on impressionism than any later European movement, but the originality and success of the work rests primarily on Shore's decision to appropriate techniques which an impressionist may have used for a minor, distant group, and use them on a larger scale for his principal figures.

Again Brandt's influence cannot be ignored. It was in this series of circus studies that Shore first heeded Brandt's advice to paint not from nature but from imagination. For a professedly poor draughtsman, this was a daring subject to attempt from memory. Shore rarely painted figures from life, and then almost never in motion; outside of this example, animals are virtually unknown in his work. That this experiment was so successful is extraordinary. The part played by luck should perhaps not be underestimated; and Shore's decision to destroy the other circus studies may have been a wise one.

The two 1929 flowerpieces (Plates 39, 40) display some striking differences, particularly in the treatment of the backgrounds. Bowl of Camellias (Pl 39) extends the trend, seen emerging in Red Camellias of the previous year, towards merging the perpendicular planes of the table-top and the wall behind the flowers. In Bowl of Camellias these planes lose their identity as the neutral browns of the 'horizontal' plane curve up to blend into the swirling blue-grey of the wall. Only where the colour of the shadow changes abruptly along a straight line, and in the indeterminate area to the left of the painting, is a boundary between planes clearly indicated. A waving, discontinuous grey line running horizontally across the foreground suggests a table edge, but the muted tones barely change as they traverse it. The effect is of a bowl of flowers suspended before a gradually sloping backdrop. This results in a precarious equilibrium from which the bowl and flowers threaten to slide forward out of the frame.

The tight, oval arrangement of the bowl, leaves and flowers is matched by the slightly cramped handling of the flowers, painted using techniques learned under Meldrum. The central red camellia bears a strong resemblance to the largest flower in a study of Frater's from the early twenties (Pl 41). Shore's Bowl of Camellias quite lacks the vitality of Red Camellias and also suffers by comparison, in this respect, with the earlier flowerpieces Camellias, Carnations and Iris.

Rhododendrons (Pl 40) brings together a variety of influences and techniques. The most obvious change from

earlier still lifes is the prominence given to background details, and the way in which these details are allowed to interact with the main subject. The leaves to the left of the painting blend with a yellow-green section of the patterned backdrop, and the blue background shapes to the right could be read, but for their colour, as extensions of the foliage. The multicoloured stripes on slightly different levels left and right of the jar merge rather than separate backdrop and table surface, unifying the depicted space and the picture surface.

The background screen in the 1926 Carnations was shown in some detail, but the misty treatment of its decorations prevented it from intruding on the unity of the flower arrangement. There is no such softening of the background elements in Rhododendrons; their outlines are clearly marked in firm dark lines resulting in a spatial ambiguity seen in many of Matisse's still lifes and portraits. As could be expected, in view of the number and quality of colour reproductions of Matisse's work then available to Shore, the brilliance of Matisse's colour is lacking. This, together with the proportion of the picture space taken up by the vase and flowers, gives the work an overcrowded, busy appearance which requires some concentration to resolve.

The light outlining of the petals has been retained from earlier flowerpieces, but glimmers of Meldrum's training can be seen in a renewed interest in tonal modelling in the flower heads, and in the choice and treatment of the heavy pot.¹

1 This pot was to remain a favourite of Shore's. It reappears in at least four later flower studies.

The strangely lumpy surface supporting the vase has been created using the uniform oblique shading derived from Cézanne by way of Frater. This demonstrable eclecticism results in a work which lacks the impact of some of Shore's later flower studies, where he has settled more happily into a style of his own.

Union Street Windsor (Pl 42) appears in neither the catalogue of the one-man exhibition in August 1929 nor that of the TMP show in September. This would suggest that it was painted late in the year, as Shore was short of oils for the one-man show and would certainly have included this work had it been available. The distant trees, however, are bare of leaves, placing it in the winter months. The painting could have been completed in the late winter after the entries for both exhibitions had been finalised, but an alternative explanation is that this is in fact Raleigh Street, an exhibit in the TMP show of 1929. Raleigh and Union are adjacent parallel streets in Windsor. When the painting was included in the Australian Galleries retrospective nearly thirty years later, Shore may have confused the location.

Shore has here reverted to an impressionistic style. The colours and the application of paint are more reminiscent of Monet than of any later artist. There is no sign of the dark outlines of the works from 1927 - on the contrary, the uppermost window in the house to the right of the painting seems almost to melt into the wall in the manner of the features in Monet's cathedral facades. The brilliant colours of Back Yard Idyll and The Circus have been discarded in favour of muted, almost pastel, colours. This picture would hardly have raised an eyebrow in Melbourne even in the early twenties.

The four works dated 1929 demonstrate the variety of styles in which Shore was working during the late twenties, but his first one-man exhibition ranged even more widely. The Athenaeum Gallery, which could accommodate 150 exhibits for Twenty Melbourne Painters shows, had been booked by Shore six months in advance for the joint exhibition which he, Frater, de Chimay and Isabel Tweddle had discussed. On informing Frater (whom he describes as the go-between in the discussions) of the booking, Shore was surprised to hear that the others were unlikely to wish to proceed with the plans. He decided to mount his own one-man show, believing that in six months he could produce enough to fill the gallery. But "when it was necessary to muster what I could show, there were only some fifteen oils. The bulk of the show had to be made up with pastel sketches and drawings." (AMSA, p93)

It must be assumed that Shore here refers to fifteen new works, because the catalogue of the exhibition lists twenty-four oils and an equal number of drawings. To build up the number of oils, Shore drew on works from earlier years, possibly from as early as his Meldrum period. The Age critic, in his review of the exhibition, specifically mentioned Long 'Un and a Self Portrait as early works which showed the artist to be a "capable normal painter."¹ Long 'Un was exhibited in the 1925 TMP show (as surely no two works could share this title), and The Letter Rack (No 19 in the exhibition) is probably the work of the same title exhibited with the Twenty Melbourne Painters in 1928.

1 Age, August 13, 1929, p7.

Other re-exhibited works are more difficult to pinpoint, but two are worthy of special mention. The probability that The Parrot (No 2) and Back Yard Idyll were identical has already been discussed, the balance of the evidence suggesting that the two were the same. The change in name may have been proposed by the gallery manager, Edith Smart; this would explain Shore's reversion to the original title in his scrapbook.

The Chinese Figure (No 13) was probably the work shown in London in 1923 (Pl 10); Shore certainly still had it in his possession. If so, it shows that Shore was prepared to include in his exhibition at least one work which made no concession to modernism. Although he was later to claim, with justification, that this exhibition was the "absolute first of any pretension to modernism in Melbourne" (AMSA, p94), it could not be interpreted as a militant exposition of modernism or even a decisive rejection of traditional styles if these earlier examples were allowed to hang beside his most recent efforts. There were no explanatory notes in the catalogue, nor was there even an opening speech; Shore had not had the courage to ask anybody to open the show for him.

No extant work is positively identifiable as having been included in the one-man exhibition, although five known paintings, including The Parrot and The Chinese Figure can be regarded as probable contenders. The Circus (Pl 37) was included in Shore's 1957 retrospective, where it was described in the catalogue as "from first one-man exhibition, 1929." Shore's sales book refers to The Circus as being "given to Miss A.Plante after 1st one-man show."¹

1 A later addition in the sales book records that the picture was returned to Shore in 1953, following Miss Plante's death in 1952, by her sister.

However, even this work cannot be certainly equated with any entry in the 1929 catalogue; there was no exhibit entitled Circus or The Circus. It could be either Impressions of a Circus (No 9) or The Rider (No 10); on the other hand it may be a painting entitled The Circus which was shown in the Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition a month after the one-man show.

Of the six Shores in the 1929 TMP show, only two have titles which appear in the catalogue of the solo exhibition, and these - 'Flowers' and 'Camellias' - were both used by Shore many times. Probably no work was included in both exhibitions. Only four weeks separated the close of one and the opening of the other, and Shore would have been reluctant to show the same works in the same gallery within such a short space of time. If the circus study now in the NGV was shown with the Twenty Melbourne Painters, Shore could be excused for confusing the two exhibitions in later years.

The extant work most likely to have come from the one-man show is Rhododendrons (Pl 40), which was sold from A.M.E. Bale's estate in 1981. Both the sales book and Shore's annotated copy of the 1929 exhibition catalogue list the purchasers of the six exhibits sold. In the catalogue the buyers' names are given together with the price paid; the sales book also gives a brief description of the work. Miss Bale's six guinea purchase is described in the sales book as a flowerpiece, and only three works were offered for six guineas - Rhododendrons (No 15), Camellias (No 18) and The Letter Rack (No 19). Recognition of the flowers in Plate 40 as

rhododendrons¹ completes the identification, if circumstantially.

One other exhibit appears to have survived. The coloured-pencil drawing shown in Plate 43 was owned by George Bell; it has been known in his family as 'The Verandah' and has traditionally been dated 1928, although it bears no date or inscription, and is not signed. It can tentatively be identified with the 1929 exhibit entitled The Verandah (No 44), which, on the basis of its price (four guineas) and place in the catalogue, must have been a drawing or a pastel.

It has also been accepted in the Bell family that the seated figure is Frater, and the red patch of hair confirms this. The profusion of trees in the background, and the angle from which they are seen, strongly suggest that the drawing was made during one of the holidays at Warrandyte in a house set on one of the hills with which the area abounds. In his description of his first holiday at Warrandyte Shore mentions "a large verandah which fronted the house." (AMSA, p87) Although this drawing was probably not completed on the first holiday, and the next (Easter) holiday was spent in a smaller cottage alone with his mother, it is possible that Shore and Frater returned to the larger house on other occasions.²

1 Although at Joel's sale in November 1981 it was catalogued simply as Still Life, and there is no inscription on the reverse of the painting.

2 It has been argued that Shore's first holiday was taken during the summer of 1925-6. Furthermore, the only works completed on this occasion were "a few sketches with pastel chalks, a simple school box of half a dozen colours." (AMSA, p88) Tom Henderson, who arrived in Australia early in 1926, recalled weekends at Warrandyte in a house rented by Shore and Frater, and Arthur Frater remembers that his father shared a house with Shore and his mother on several occasions.

Stylistically the drawing cannot be dated with accuracy. The nature of the medium demands the liberal use of firm outlines, even if the artist was at the time turning away from them in his painting. The brisk, oblique pencil strokes of the foliage suggest a familiarity with Cézanne, and a willingness to adopt his ideas, which is less evident in the oils of the late twenties. The clumsy, unresolved figure of Frater betrays Shore's weakness in draughtsmanship, but the freedom with which he has wielded his pencils, especially in the background, injects considerable vitality into a careful composition which could otherwise have run the risk of rigidity.

The critical responses to Shore's one-man exhibition will be considered in some detail in Chapter . Most of the reviewers in the daily press were guarded in their criticisms, probably conscious of overseas movements beyond their full comprehension, and reluctant to commit themselves to comments which could mark them as intolerant or ignorant. Shore, who could hardly have expected encouraging reviews from men who had ridiculed his work in TMP shows, was not disappointed; in retrospect he considered that the critics, for the most part, had been "friendly rather than otherwise." (AMSA, p94)

The six sales grossed twenty-three guineas, which covered most of the expenses associated with the exhibition, but no major work was sold, and most of the purchasers were friends.¹

1 The purchasers listed on Shore's copy of the catalogue were Miss Bale (6 guineas), Mrs Tweddle, Mr Brandt and Miss Plante (each 3 gns.) - all close associates of Shore's - as well as Mr J.B.Walker (5 gns.) and Mrs Hartrick (3 gns.). The sales book gives the additional information that Mrs Tweddle, Miss Plante and Horace Brandt bought pastel sketches, and that Mrs Hartrick's purchase was a watercolour 'Fish Study'. Mr Walker's is described simply as a sketch.

Nevertheless Shore was satisfied with the outcome ("I fared much better than expected," AMSA, p94), and the exhibition can be seen as marking the end of his directionless experimentation. Its modest success vindicated his decision to persevere, in the face of apathy and opposition, with a painting style which did not conform to the expectations of the Melbourne public. From this time his work takes on a more recognizably distinctive flavour. His increased confidence is reflected in a more consistent style which blends the varied influences he had so far experienced with a rich vigour of his own.

Now that each of Shore's extant works from the twenties has been considered, we can examine the European reproductions to which he had access during that period, in an attempt to discover the most likely sources of his inspiration. There is no doubt that illustrations in books and periodicals provided Shore with most of his sources - there were simply no original modern European works available for him to study.

It is, however, impossible to pinpoint with certainty any individual work seen by him in reproduction between the time of the Outline of Art revelations and the end of the decade. We know that he bought copies of Formes and Cahiers d'Art from Gino Nibbi, but this was not until Nibbi's shop opened in 1930. Shore's own library is of limited help. He sold many of his books and magazines shortly before his death¹,

1 By auction, together with some of his paintings, at Joel's over several sales during 1963. Although several of the paintings can be identified through the catalogues, the books and magazines are not described.

and of the remainder many of the early works were purchased long after their publication.¹

Shore was an avid reader, interested in all he could discover about current art movements in Europe (although not necessarily appreciative of all he saw). It is highly probable that he visited the State Library of Victoria, if not regularly, at least on occasions, to study the art periodicals to which the Library subscribed. Consideration will be given here to those periodicals most likely to have been seen by Shore: Studio, Colour, Artwork and The Dial.

The first three of these were published in London and were weighted heavily towards British artists in articles and reproductions. The Dial, published monthly in New York, was primarily a literary review with a few illustrations, but these, for the most part, were reproductions of works by French and other European artists. The State Library received a copy of each within a few weeks of its publication.

The Dial was cited by Frater as influencing him prior to 1925 with its reproductions of paintings by Cézanne, Matisse and Van Gogh, but it has been shown (see p 87) that these artists received only meagre coverage in the period up to 1924. It has also been argued that Frater ascribed to the early twenties works which he had painted no earlier than 1927. Furthermore, Frater's Olympus (Pl 21), which he retrospectively dated 1921, shows a striking resemblance to

1 Shore inscribed some books with his name and the year of acquisition. Others are stamped with the imprint of the Leonardo Book Shop, placing their purchase no earlier than 1930.

two works illustrated in The Dial of May 1927 and August 1928.¹

If, as this suggests, Frater read The Dial throughout the twenties, it is highly probable that Shore did too; this was the period of their closest association. A regular feature entitled 'Modern Art', written in a breezy manner by Henry McBride, would have kept Shore aware of some of the names and ideas being discussed in America and Europe. Each issue, however, carried only one illustration in colour (even this luxury was discontinued after 1927) and the quality of the colour reproduction was poor, so that The Dial can in no way be credited with encouraging Shore's freer use of colour.

Derain's work was illustrated on several occasions, but the only example reproduced in colour was a dark-toned Still Life from his later, less colourful period. Picasso was well represented by the late twenties, but Shore was never able to appreciate that master.² The strongest connection between any reproduction in The Dial and an extant work of Shore's is provided by Marie Laurencin's Circus (Pl 46, July 1927, p44, black-and-white), which has as its subject a female acrobat standing on a horse's back - but a direct influence on Shore's The Circus could not be claimed with confidence.

1 Cézanne's Baigneurs (Pl 44), illustrated Vol 82, May 1927, p361; and Picasso's Baigneuses (Pl 45), illustrated Vol 84, August 1928, p93.

2 In an article in the Argus Magazine Section, August 26, 1950, Shore wrote of "Picasso's insipid inventions of profile and full face seen together." Elsewhere we even find: "I had been disgusted by reproductions of extravagances by Picasso - some reminded me of nothing so much as bad leadlight designs." (AMSA, pl78)

The only periodical available through the twenties which was specifically mentioned by Shore in his memoirs is Studio. He was familiar with the magazine as early as 1917, as he cited a Turner reproduction in Studio as the inspiration behind one of his V.A.S. exhibits in that year. There were also several early issues of Studio in Shore's library, although their number and spacing¹ suggest that he acquired only occasional issues, possibly second-hand long after their publication. At least we know he was aware of the existence of Studio - a point about which some doubt could be raised in the cases of the potentially more informative Colour and Artwork.

Studio was by no means a progressive journal during the twenties. Its gradual and belated acceptance of modernism was not many years in advance of Melbourne's, and ran parallel and remarkably close to Shore's own development. Most of the artists whose work was illustrated were British, and the more adventurous British artists were represented either by early, relatively conventional offerings (Paul Nash, Mark Gertler and Charles Ginner were so treated), or by industrial designs: tiles and tapestry designs by Vanessa Bell, Duncan Grant and Roger Fry were considered suitable for reproduction, but their paintings were not.²

- 1 The six pre-war issues in his possession on his death were from August 1909, May 1918, September 1928, October 1930, May 1931 and January 1938.
- 2 In a brief review of a 1928 exhibition of Roger Fry's paintings, the Studio critic described the exhibits as "rather too assertive in their modernity of manner, and . . . with a few exceptions, definitely disagreeable in their awkwardness of executive method and their rankness of colour," Studio, Vol 95, January 1928, p45.

This attitude also prevailed towards contemporary French artists. Tapestry designs by Picasso, Leger and Lurçat, a Braque costume design, a backcloth by Derain and some Picasso ballet sets were all reproduced in Studio during 1927. The following year brought a brocade fabric design by Dufy, and Klimt's The Kiss, described as a "design for mosaic." No painting, as such, by any of these artists was illustrated before 1929, and then only in black-and-white. Contemporary art of the colonies was better represented than that of continental Europe.¹

French post-impressionism was considered by the Studio editors to be worthy of reproduction. A Gauguin flowerpiece illustrated in colour (Pl 47) is so close in format to Shore's Flowers of 1927 (Pl 33), down to the diamond pattern barely discernible on both vases, that it is hard to accept that one was painted without knowledge of the other. The issue containing the Gauguin (Vol 93, April 1927) was received at the State Library in Melbourne on May 19; in September Shore exhibited Flowers with the Twenty Melbourne Painters. Another flowerpiece, Van Gogh's Lauriers Roses (Pl 48), illustrated in the January 1927 issue, may also be seen as an influence on Flowers through the firm, dark outlines of the leaves and the treatment of the table.

In seeking reproductions which could have contributed to the liberation of Shore's brushwork and colour in the late

1 Apart from a brief report from William Moore on the state of art in Australia (in which John D. Moore was described as "the most prominent painter of the modern group," Vol 91, May 1926, p359), works by Will Ashton, Norman and Lionel Lindsay, Janet Cumbræ-Stewart, Louis McCubbin, James R. Jackson, Thea Proctor and Charles Wheeler were illustrated during the period 1924-1927.

twenties, two more from Studio are worth considering. The loose brushwork, the broadly defined figures with minimal modelling, and, most strikingly, the brilliant blue which predominates in Jean Louis Forain's Le Marchand de Tableaux (Pl 49) all have their counterparts in Shore's The Circus (Pl 37). And Matthew Smith's Flowers (Pl 50), while more closely related to Shore's flowerpieces of the thirties than to any of his known works from the twenties, could have helped to convince Shore that Horace Brandt's vigorous approach also had more eminent practitioners.¹

The periodical with the greatest potential for advancing the cause of modernism in Melbourne immediately after the first world war was Colour. Its influence in Sydney has been acknowledged², but in Melbourne its pictorial lessons were ignored if they were seen at all. Shore was probably unaware of Colour's existence during his years with Meldrum. He would have had little time to visit the State Library when he was working at Brooks Robinson during the day and at Meldrum's studio in the evenings. Meldrum would not have encouraged wider reading which could have conflicted with his own teachings; and the Meldrumites, secure in their own beliefs, were happy to remain isolated from developments in Europe.

- 1 The Forain was reproduced in Vol 93, June 1927, p382; the Smith appeared in Vol 97, November 1929, p771.
- 2 By John Young, in his evidence to the New South Wales High Court, in the case arising from the 1943 Archibald Prize award. Typescript of the evidence, AGNSW, p70, quoted by Bernard Smith in Australian Painting, p194.

Had Shore been a reader of Colour during those years he would not have found the Outline of Art reproductions at all startling. The journal, which described itself as "the most exciting magazine in the world," featured high quality coloured reproductions of contemporary art. Although it leant towards British artists, it acknowledged the importance of the French, and many of the English artists represented displayed an undisguised indebtedness not only to French post-impressionism but to later European movements as well.

During 1919 and 1920, readers were treated to reproductions of works by Vuillard, Vlaminck, Kisling, Modigliani and Derain¹, as well as vorticist-inspired works by C.R.W. Nevinson and Wyndham Lewis² and a portrait by Harold Gilman featuring violent distortions of colour (August 1919, p18).

The June 1921 issue of Colour could have opened Shore's eyes (half-closed in fealty to Meldrum) to the possibilities of post-impressionism and developments from it some years earlier, and more strikingly, than did the Outline of Art in 1924. That issue contained an excellent reproduction of a brilliantly coloured late work by the Royal Academician William Strang (Pl 51). The foreground is strongly reminiscent of Gauguin in the women's poses, the reduced modelling of their bodies and the flat planes of rich colour.

1 Respectively in the issues of July 1919 (p133), October 1919 (p57), November 1919 (p76), December 1919 (p94) and May 1920 (p74).

2 An accompanying article on Wyndham Lewis (Colour, March 1919, pp24-7) discussed vorticism and his relationship with the movement.

The vibrant background draws heavily on Van Gogh, but also shows an admiration for fauvist use of unnatural colour.

Another striking work by Strang (Pl 52) had been reproduced in the April issue.¹ Both were far more advanced than his detailed Victorian genre scene, Bank Holiday (Pl 53), illustrated in Orpen's Outline of Art, where it was aptly described as uniting Legros' classical drawing with Manet's realism. The June issue of Colour also reproduced Paul Nash's eerie Sea Wall (Pl 54) with its echoes of de Chirico and early surrealism.

The point is made that these and many other reproductions illustrating aspects of contemporary European activity were freely accessible to any casual reader at the State Library in the early twenties. That no Melbourne artist accepted the challenge they posed, or even tentatively experimented with the ideas they suggested, attests to the unshakably entrenched artistic conservatism of the city at that time. It also indicates that Melbourne's artists lacked familiarity with contemporary artistic thought, from which much experimental work could have sprung.

From 1921 a new editorial policy rendered Colour far less progressive, but Shore could still have learned from it. By mid-1923 he was searching for an alternative to the Meldrum tenets he had recently foresworn, and the highly Cézannesque Portrait of a Woman by Gauguin (Pl 55), reproduced in the April issue of that year, could have

1 Colour, April 1921, p48. This work is dated 1921; Strang had died by the time the second painting appeared in June.

introduced him to post-impressionism several months before the Outline of Art did. The integration of subject, background and supporting surface which was to interest Shore in the late twenties and early thirties was admirably demonstrated in a work by the Australian Arthur Baker-Clack (Pl 56) reproduced in Colour in July-August, 1925.

Although it is difficult to associate any individual work of Shore's with reproductions in Colour, it is clear that the innovative works of the late twenties - in particular Back Yard Idyll and The Circus and, no doubt, some works between those two which have not been discovered - were influenced by coloured reproductions; and Colour contained more such reproductions, of a higher quality, than any other periodical then available in Melbourne.

A stronger case can be made for Shore's having seen at least some copies of Artwork, another London based periodical established in 1924. From its inception, Artwork was the most progressive art journal subscribed to by the State Library of Victoria. All its illustrations, however, were in black-and-white.

During 1925 and 1926, Artwork ran a three-part series by Bernard Rackham entitled 'Glass Painting as an Art for Today'.¹ It is almost inconceivable that such a series would not have been brought to the attention of Shore, working for a firm which specialized in the production of stained-glass for all religious, domestic and industrial purposes. The articles themselves contained nothing of

1 Artwork, Vol. 2, Nos. 5, 6, 7.

relevance to Shore's oil paintings, but the three issues in which they appeared also contained reproductions of works by Kandinsky, Kokoschka, Matisse and Vlaminck, as well as a lengthy illustrated article by Clive Bell on members of the Bloomsbury group (see note 2, p114).

If Shore was introduced to Artwork through the Bernard Rackham articles, he would probably have continued to read the magazine, if irregularly, at the State Library. Although his sense of responsibility to his mother would usually have drawn him straight home after work, his evenings were now free, and an occasional hour in the Library would have been a luxury he could easily have allowed himself.

It would be asking too much of coincidence to suggest that the reproductions of two paintings in the Summer, 1927 issue of Artwork - one featuring a parrot and the other, on the opposite page, a birdcage (Plates 57, 58) - were unconnected with the exhibition of Shore's Back Yard Idyll in September of that year. That issue of Artwork was received at the State Library on July 14, 1927¹; the Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition in which Back Yard Idyll appeared opened on September 6, which would comfortably have allowed Shore to see the reproduction, paint his picture, and enter it in time for inclusion in the catalogue.

Neither of the reproductions is particularly close in style to Back Yard Idyll, other possible influences on which

1 The date of receipt was stamped on the cover of periodicals arriving at the Library.

have already been discussed (see p 120). Shore's bird is as dependent on the woman's profile head surmounting a twisted neck in Georg Kars' Woman with Parrot (Pl 57) as on her parrot. Picasso's The Birdcage (Pl 58) is more geometrically simplified than Shore could ever bring himself to accept. However, the juxtaposition of the Picasso and the Kars, facing each other, can be seen as the direct inspiration of the subject of Back Yard Idyll. The Kars would have brought Shore's own parrot to his mind, and suggested the worthiness of his pet as the subject of a painting.

Reflections of other paintings reproduced in Artwork during the late twenties can be found in several of Shore's works over the next few years. He recorded that The Circus was painted from memory; but it can be seen as an amalgam of memories including the scenes witnessed at Warrandyte, the girl on horseback in Laurencin's Circus (Pl 46), and Spencer Gore's The Ladder Act (Pl 59) illustrated in Artwork, Summer 1928 (p127). In Gore's work the performers are modelled very similarly to Shore's rider, with a few broad, simple strokes. The impression of the audience is also conveyed in a similar manner, with brisk dots and dashes of paint clustered around the perimeter of the ring and ascending towards the apex of the tent.

The pose of Philip Wilson Steer's Mrs Raynes (Pl 60; Artwork, Spring 1929, p11) is very close to that of Shore's Chef (Pl 83). Thomas Lowinsky's The Visitation (Pl 61; Artwork, Summer 1926, p143) bears many similarities to Shore's The Invitation (Pl 77). These resemblances could be coincidental; in both cases Shore's painting was executed

several years after the corresponding Artwork reproduction appeared. The direct influence of an article in the Autumn 1928 issue can be asserted with more confidence. Written by Jane Quigley and entitled 'The Flowerpiece'¹, it examined the recent treatment of Shore's favourite subject matter, and was accompanied by a number of illustrations which, despite their lack of colour, would greatly have interested him.

Flowerpieces by Frank Brangwyn (whose vigour Shore had admired in the past) and Derain, Matisse and Vanessa Bell (whose names were now familiar to him) exemplified a variety of current European approaches to the subject. They shared a simplification of form and a suppression of detail which Shore was gradually incorporating into his own work. The reproduction which most clearly prefigured Shore's future treatment of flowers was Still Life by Elliot Seabrooke (Pl 62), exhibited in a retrospective exhibition of the London Group. Even in a photograph, the texture of the picture surface is evident. The forms of the flowers have been built up through the lavish application of thick impastos, resulting in a near-sculptural effect. This illustration also could have lent credence to the practices of Horace Brandt.

This survey of the reproductions most likely to have been seen by Shore during the twenties may seem inconclusive, in that no single work is positively known to have been seen by him, and none of his own known works can with certainty

1 Artwork, Vol 4, No 15, Autumn 1928, pp194f.

be connected with any available reproduction. But similarities have been noted, and possible influences suggested. In total, the evidence supports the conclusion that Shore was familiar with some and perhaps all of these periodicals; that he absorbed the ideas expressed, and incorporated many of them, in some cases probably unconsciously, into his later canvases; but that he was too aware of the need for individual expression to be tempted to follow any particular European artist too closely.

Shore's selective eclecticism, combined with a willingness to experiment, not surprisingly resulted in a wide variety of effects, some less successful than others. It also provided a broadly based foundation for the more consistent style he developed in the thirties, and ensured that the sources from which his later works derived were sufficiently varied to avoid stagnation.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE BELL-SHORE SCHOOL

At the beginning of the thirties, Shore was faced with problems more pressing than those presented by reproductions in the latest magazines from Europe. His job was no longer secure, and his skills and experience were limited to a trade which was never to recover fully from the depression. His approach to George Bell with the proposal of opening a school together was an inspired move prompted by desperate circumstances.

At some time in 1930, at his own instigation, Shore agreed to work only half of each week at Brooks Robinson for half pay. He undertook to design for no rival firm in his free time, although in the economic climate of the early thirties, and particularly in the severely affected stained-glass trade, it is unlikely that he could have found freelance work if he had sought it.

Shore had discussed with his mother the possibility of losing his job entirely as a result of the trade slump; his decision to accept half a week's work may have been taken in the hope that he would then be more likely to be retained if sackings became necessary. Shore's natural caution, and his mother's and his own reliance on the income from Brooks Robinson, suggest this as a more likely reason than the extra time the half-week gave him for painting. This extra time, however, was fully appreciated by Shore, and properly utilised:

I painted continuously during this time, and when the best of my output was shown, the critics paid me much better attention than ever before. (AMSA, p101)

It will be useful to establish as accurately as possible the timing of this period of half-time employment.

Shore, as usual, gives no precise date for it in the manuscripts. Following his description in AMSA of Ranunculus, definitely painted in 1930, he states that Daryl Lindsay bought the painting from the Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition following its return from Paris (the 1931 TMP exhibition). The next section of the manuscript begins: "That year I made an arrangement with the manager, my own idea, to accept half weeks work for the whole year." 'That year' could refer to either 1930 or 1931; it is also possible that Shore, looking back, was unsure of when, and even for how long, he worked on a half-time basis.

Shore's lengthy description of a gold mining venture in which Basil Burdett and he were jointly involved contains some clues to the dating of his half-time work. Gold was found on his land at Warrandyte, but as he was buying the land from the Government under terms which reserved the right for miners to work it, Shore had no claim on it. In exchange for ten pounds worth of explosives, Shore obtained a written promise of one-eighth of all gold found. "It was worth the risk," he wrote, "even though my funds were getting down." The miners worked the land, with little success, "for weeks and months." They then decided to try another district, still using the explosives provided by Shore so that he retained an interest in their finds.

"Some six months passed," at the end of which time one of the miners with whom Shore had maintained a correspondence returned to Melbourne with some gold-bearing quartz. This resulted in Burdett and Shore contributing to the purchase of a second-hand truck to be used in transporting the quartz to the nearest crushing battery. The miner set out again three weeks after arriving in Melbourne, but "a few weeks" later the scheme had crashed, and the truck was returned to Shore.¹

The entire gold-mining saga took place prior to Shore's approach to Bell late in 1931. This must place the first discovery on Shore's land no later than the earliest months of that year, if we are to accept Shore's estimates of the time spent on each stage of the operation. Shore's contribution of ten pounds worth of explosives, when gold was first discovered on his land, was made despite the fact that his "funds were getting down." This suggests that at that stage he had been working on a part-time basis for some considerable time, and that the half-time arrangement must therefore have begun in 1930.

When Shore first exhibited the work produced during his half-time period, he noticed a distinct improvement in critical response (see p 159). Unfortunately the reviews of the 1930 and 1931 TMP shows (Shore joined no other exhibiting society until 1932) are both more encouraging than those of 1929 and 1930 respectively, so that it is still not clear whether he began this period before or after the

1 These details of the gold-mining venture are given in AMSA, pp101-5.

TMP exhibition of September 1930.

Shore is more likely to have embarked on his Paris Salon venture when he was working full-time, as the expenses involved were considerable. He was also prepared to pay Brandt's expenses following that artist's rejection. Shore would have been reluctant to help in this way if he were receiving only half a salary - but the payment of Brandt's expenses must have been undertaken in the later part of 1930, as the Autumn Salon was in October.

The final piece of evidence, though only circumstantial, is the number of works from 1930 and 1931 which have survived: only two oils and a pencil sketch are known from 1930, whereas there exist six paintings from 1931. If Shore had begun his part-time employment in the first half of 1930, we could expect more extant works from that year. A date in the latter part of 1930 is tentatively suggested.

Shore's decision to accept half-pay for a year had disappointing if foreseeable results, which were aggravated by his naively unsuccessful gold-mining venture. The several pages of manuscript devoted to the search for gold reveal a rarely exposed and little-exercised materialism. His excitement at the prospect of sudden wealth is touching in its child-like simplicity.

This gold business. What was going to happen? Should we really be fortunate enough to gain a lot of money? Should I be able to calmly regard all my time as free for painting; be able to possess all the colours, brushes and canvases, easels and what not I required? Should I have all the clothes I wanted, be able to go anywhere, at any

time? I almost saw myself as a man about town, casually entering expensive clubs in the manner born. (AMSA, pp107-8)

At that time he was thirty four years of age, had never lived away from his mother, and had spent his entire working life of some twenty years in a subservient position with one firm. It was financial necessity which prompted him within only a few months to make the bold decision of entering into a partnership with George Bell.

The pages referring to their gold prospecting also indicate the closeness of the relationship between Shore and Burdett. Burdett was to become a champion of Shore's - he wrote two brief but laudatory articles on him for Art in Australia¹ - and helped the artist in other ways. Shore wrote of Burdett:

He performed innumerable good deeds on my behalf almost as a matter of course. If I wanted to know anything he could tell me, or needed particular advice, Basil was always willing to help. (AMSA, p103)

Shore was only one of many artists who benefited from Burdett's knowledgeable and unbiased criticism and assistance. But Shore, thirsting for first-hand overseas experience, and working in a public climate far from enthusiastic about his art, must have gained immeasurable stimulation and encouragement from his friend.

When Shore finally accepted the collapse of his dreams of instant wealth, he was faced with the immediate problem of finding adequate financial support for himself and his mother.

1 3rd series, No 45, August 1932, p22; and 3rd series, No 64, August 1936, p63.

My job had practically ceased to exist. Only a few days work, at rare intervals, came my way. I hated having to call on the manager only to be told to come and see him again next week. What the devil could I do? (AMSA, p109)

With his experience of teaching under Meldrum, Shore had already considered the possibility of opening a school of his own. Needing a partner to share the expenses of establishing a school, he had approached Frater, but their ideas of teaching were not compatible.¹

It is not clear precisely when these discussions took place, but it appears from the manuscript to have been towards the end of Shore's period of half-time employment, placing it in 1931, possibly not long before his approach to Bell. That some time elapsed between Shore's sounding out Frater and approaching Bell is clear; Shore wrote, following his comment on Frater's ideas of teaching, that the idea of opening a school had to be dropped for the time being. Shore's dwindling finances, and the remote prospect of their being replenished, probably dictated that the delay between his proposals to Frater and Bell was not more than a few months.

Shore was still receiving some casual work from Brooks Robinson when the idea of teaming with Bell struck him suddenly one evening late in 1931. He immediately wrote

1 AMSA, p102. Shore gives no details of their differences of opinion, but Frater was never a theoretician. When he later taught at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, he would demonstrate his points in paint on a student's work and rarely talked in general, theoretical terms. Shore seldom interfered with his students' work beyond making verbal suggestions. These differences emerge from discussions with Ken White, a student of Frater's at RMIT, and with Yvonne Atkinson and other artists who were students of Shore's.

a brief letter to Bell outlining the proposal, and concluded it with the comment that "if he thought my suggestion an impertinence, and told me to go to the devil I would not be annoyed." (AMSA, p115) Shortly after receiving the note, Bell telephoned Shore at work "where I was starting one of my now infrequent few days spells." Bell was interested, and invited Shore to visit him that evening; by the time Shore left in the early hours of the following morning, the partnership had been agreed upon in principle.

The two men had first met in 1922 when Bell was helping to organize the exhibition of Australian art to be held at Burlington House in London. At that time Shore was greatly impressed by the firm stand taken by Bell and W.B. McInnes on behalf of the Victorian artists whose works had been returned by the New South Wales-based selection committee. Bell and McInnes had been asked by the Sydney Society of Artists to select approximately sixty works by Victorian artists for inclusion in the exhibition. They had taken some care to choose a broadly representative collection, numbering fewer than the sixty requested, but including two works by Shore - a self-portrait and the still life Chinese Figure which was eventually shown in London. This selection was sent to Sydney and exhibited there.

When it was found that less hanging space than had been expected was available in London, the works of most of the Victorian artists were returned. Although the paintings of Bell and McInnes were retained in the show, those two fought the Sydney decision to the extent of applying for a High Court injunction to prevent the departure of the exhibition from

Australia. Although the application was unsuccessful, the action taken by Bell and McInnes was effective in bringing Sydney Ure Smith to Melbourne for a meeting with the aggrieved artists. After much argument, he agreed to include in the shipment at least one work by each of the Victorian artists.

Shore's respect for Bell sprang from this episode. When they next came into contact, nearly seven years later, his opinion of Bell as a man of integrity was confirmed. This followed Shore's one-man exhibition, when Bell wrote a personal note to Shore explaining that the more encouraging passages of his review of the exhibition had been cut by a sub-editor. He enclosed a rough draft of his original review, which included the comment that shows such as Shore's should be encouraged, and that he wished the artist well. (AMSA, p114)

Bell and Shore next met in December 1930 at a preview of Adrian Lawlor's first exhibition. This meeting convinced Shore that Bell lacked any understanding of modernism, although he professed an interest in it.

Bell seemed inclined to talk and I showed him some copies of the latest numbers of "Formes" to which I subscribed through Gino Nibbi, of the Leonardo Book Shop. Bell showed that he was interested in modernism but it had him puzzled. Turning over the pages of illustrations of work by Picasso, Matisse and others, he asked me "What ideas did these painters work on?" I wanted to tell him what I knew but there was a barrier. . . He obviously felt no glimmer of response to modern work, only curiosity . . . (AMSA, p114)

It was not until some weeks later that Shore discovered, to his surprise, that Bell took private pupils seeking instruction in 'modernist' art.

That seemed almost a joke. He certainly could not teach modernism. I felt rather bitter about the matter, and, subconsciously, my mind must have dwelt on it. (AMSA, p115)

It took Shore the greater part of 1931 to bring himself to approach Bell. This delay can largely be attributed to Shore's high hopes for the gold-mining venture which dragged on through that year.

Following their decision to enter into partnership, Shore and Bell immediately began planning and working towards opening their school. Frater found a suitable studio in Salisbury Chambers, on the south-east corner of Bourke and Queen Streets, which the owner, who was interested in art, allowed them to rent for three pounds a week.¹ An advertising leaflet was drawn up and printed, easels were constructed, a coke stove was installed and screens, shelves and cupboards were built. The partners bought second-hand chairs and furnished the studio with prints and hangings for the walls, a model's throne, casts and other still life objects. By the time the school opened its doors in February 1932, its resemblance to overseas studios was remarked upon by several visitors. (AMSA, p117)

1 From a taped interview with Frater made for the ABC in the early sixties. Shore's account in AMSA, p116, confirms this but does not give the weekly rental. Several photographs of the studio are reproduced in Eagle and Minchin, op.cit..

The Bell-Shore school offered day, evening and Saturday afternoon classes, although initially there were not enough students to begin either the evening or Saturday groups. The printed card announcing details of the school (a copy of which is preserved in Shore's scrapbook) listed class times as "from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. and from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. daily, Sundays excepted." The fees for a ten-week term were £4.4.0 for the day class and £2.2.0 for the evening class. Only "seven or eight pupils" (AMSA, pl19) attended daily, which would just have paid the rent, but left nothing for models' fees and other running expenses. The partners must have questioned the wisdom of their enterprise during the first few weeks.

Shore had certainly not solved his financial problems. The situation improved only gradually, so that in the second year of its operations "the school was only just paying expenses, there was nothing there for me to draw . . . My mother had to draw repeatedly on her savings account, to keep the house going." (AMSA, ppl38-9) When the five shillings fee for his driving licence fell due, Shore felt compelled to sell his car, which brought him sixty pounds. His only other income came from the sale of paintings, which totalled a little over eighty pounds for the two-year period 1932-3; much of this, however, would have been expended on materials.¹

1 The sales book gives the totals of paintings sold for the years 1932 and 1933 as £51.3.0 and £31.18.0 respectively. Shore lists among the advantages of his position at the school that "we had the use of the studio and models, of course" (AMSA, pl40), but the partners apparently paid for their own paints and canvases.

Bell must have been no less disappointed, although his financial situation was much more secure than Shore's. A puzzling question must be asked: Why did Bell accede to Shore's proposal in the first place? It is difficult to see what advantages he saw in the partnership. Most of the students were to come initially from Bell's own private classes which he conducted in the studio in his home in Selborne Road, Toorak. In throwing in his lot with Shore, he committed himself to the expense of fitting out a new studio, and the inconvenience of commuting to the city.

Shore believed that his own modernism attracted Bell - "his academic experience and scholarship should combine ideally with my youthful enthusiasm and awareness of modernism" (AMSA, p115) - but Bell's ignorance of modernism was not as profound as Shore imagined it to be. Mary Eagle has argued that Shore "mistook for ignorance Bell's child-like persistence and curiosity," citing the books in Bell's library and his teaching and painting of the period 1929-32 as evidence that, by 1932, "he already possessed the basis for his later modern interpretation."¹

Bell did not hope to 'learn modernism' from Shore. He knew that Shore had never been overseas, and that all his knowledge of recent European developments had been drawn from books and reproductions. Bell recognized the value of first-hand overseas experience and had already enjoyed it himself to no small extent. From the outset he made it clear that he intended, as soon as practicable, to go

1 Eagle and Minchin, op.cit., p34.

overseas again "to find the golden key to modernism."¹ Shore was slightly affronted by the implication that he could not supply the key, but he was sufficiently confident of his own understanding of modernism to believe that Bell might change his mind about going overseas after they had worked together.

Bell's attitude to Shore's work had changed from one of mild approval and encouragement at the time of his 1929 one-man show to one of open admiration of the works exhibited with the Twenty Melbourne Painters in 1931. In a review entitled 'Gaiety Dominant' he wrote:

Mr Shore shows a good still life in which form is more adequately treated than it was last year. His colour is always interesting, but in Speaking Volumes he has produced a lovely piece of refined colour and composition. His Across the Street is also full of quality.²

Yet this high opinion alone would not induce Bell to go into partnership on an equal basis with a man about whom he knew little, and who could provide neither students nor teaching experience.

Financial considerations would have influenced Bell against rather than in favour of the partnership. Even when the school had become established, in the third year of its operation, after expenses the principals received only one pound per week each.³ While this state of affairs could not have been foreseen accurately, Bell must have realised

1 This precise term, presumably Bell's, is quoted in both FYSF and AMSA, p116.

2 Sun, September 15, 1931, p13.

3 AMSA, p140; AMSB, p105; FYSF.

in advance that he was unlikely to be better off financially under the new arrangement than when teaching privately in his home studio.

He also had little to gain, and quite possibly something to lose, in the way of reputation by associating himself with a much younger artist whose reception by the public and critics up to that time could hardly have been described as warm. Was his acceptance of Shore's proposal a gesture of defiance to the Melbourne art establishment? This would tally with his later contempt for the Australian Academy of Art, and the prominent part he was to play in the Contemporary Art Society. While hardly sufficient reason in itself to explain his joining forces with Shore, such a gesture could well have influenced his decision.

Another distinct possibility which reflects less well on him is that Bell saw in Shore a convenient replacement for himself during his proposed trip to Europe. Not only would Shore keep his students together, but he could, and did, take over Bell's reviewing commitments on the Sun News Pictorial, and continue a series of lectures which Bell had started.

Bell was ready to go abroad at any time. His only reason for delaying his departure, as he told Shore, was that he did not wish to take his wife and daughter into a Europe likely to be engulfed in war. (AMSA, p116) Having waited over two years from the beginning of the partnership for the European situation to improve, he suddenly announced his intention to go. In view of European conditions in 1934, it is more likely that Bell simply grew tired of

waiting than that he believed there had been a genuine easing of tensions in Europe.

If this was Bell's principal reason for entering into the partnership with Shore, it would explain the barrier which Shore always felt existed between them.¹ More importantly, it would also explain the change in attitude which Shore noticed in Bell on his return (see p213), and Bell's decision some months later to disband the partnership: it was no longer of any use to him.

Whatever Bell's reasons, there is no doubt that Shore stood to gain considerably more from the partnership than did Bell. Although the school did not fulfil the hopes which Shore had held for it - particularly in that it failed to generate enough money for him to live on - he benefited greatly from the venture in a number of ways. His decision to approach Bell had profound effects on his entire subsequent career.

Shore's experience at the Bourke Street school can not, however, be seen to have had a pronounced influence on his painting style. The most far-reaching effects were on his private and professional life, through the contacts he made at the school, the tasks he was asked to perform in Bell's absence, and the improvement in his own self-esteem engendered by the position of responsibility in which he found himself.

1 The barrier is mentioned in the quotation on p173, and elsewhere Shore writes of Bell: "His reputation as artist, critic and lecturer was enough of itself to keep a distance between us, but added to this were his somewhat heavy manner, and build, and his nearly nineteen years seniority in age." (AMSA, p111)

In her chapter on the Bourke Street school, Mary Eagle has reprinted a large extract from AMSA (pp119-124) which describes the day-to-day working of the school, and outlines some of the theories and techniques which Bell and Shore instilled into their pupils.¹ She points out that most of these teaching methods had been used by Bell in his private classes at Selborne Road. This is not surprising; Shore's teaching experience was limited to the evening class at Meldrum's, from which little would still be of relevance to the new students.

Although the partnership agreement stipulated equality between the partners, it seems clear that Bell's was the guiding hand and the dominant spirit of the school, if for no reasons other than his age and experience, and the fact that most of the earliest students had already studied under him. Shore, however, did not subjugate his own personality or artistic preferences, and this led to some confusion on the part of students who had to adjust to the weekly, or fortnightly, switches from one master to another.

Mary Eagle concludes, from her extensive interviews with students who worked under them, that the basic difference between the two men was that "Bell was classic, in control of himself and demanding of his students the same head-awareness, whereas Shore was a romantic, teaching by response and example."² It is as an instinctive and gifted colourist rather than as a theoretician that Shore is remembered by his students.

1 Eagle and Minchin, op.cit., pp35-7.

2 Ibid., p37. Considerable space is devoted to the differences in approach of Shore and Bell as seen through the eyes of individual students, pp38-40.

Shore had hoped to use an approach the outline of which reads oddly in view of his own devotion to painting from nature:

perhaps it would have been possible to make them do simple exercises in colour harmony, and simple studies of fundamental shapes, volumes and patterns, from which would spring essays in three-dimensional composition. Work from nature would have been only allowed at times, under such a system. The students would have been encouraged to look for the abstract elements of nature, rather than seek to imitate its effects. (AMSA, p122)

He made no attempt to effect this approach, realising that most of the students had considerable art-school experience, and would have resented this reversion to basics. Although Shore's concept has a ring of Cézanne about it, in the hands of students lacking imagination it could lead to quite sterile results.

Considering Shore's low opinion of Bell's knowledge of modernism, we could not expect to find Bell's influence emerging strongly in his partner's work. Shore did, however, acknowledge the extent to which his drawing improved under Bell's tutelage. (AMSA, p135) Shore completed a number of drawings of nudes in pencil and chalk during his time at the school. It can safely be assumed that all of Shore's extant female nudes were painted at the Bourke Street studio.¹ He did not have access to nude models after he left the school, and before approaching Bell had not drawn from the model for some fifteen years.

1 No work from his own student days has survived. Only one male nude is known (Cat. no. 244), and this is probably a 'self portrait' drawn using two mirrors.

Shore's preliminary discussions with Bell revealed, to Bell's dismay, that his partner had never painted a nude, and had not even drawn from life since his evening classes at the Gallery school. Bell reasonably asked how Shore could propose to teach drawing and painting from the nude if he didn't know what he himself could do.

He needn't have worried. We obtained a model, and painted hard all one afternoon. Aided by my enthusiasm for the nudes of Modigliani I turned out a job which so pleased Bell that he asked me to leave it with him to show his students - our students to be, we hoped. Some of them told me afterwards of how proudly he displayed my study to them. (AMSA, p117)

This nude is Bella Donna (Pl 74), now in the National Gallery of Victoria. The date of 1931 would be sufficient to identify it, as Shore would have had no other opportunity of painting a nude in that year, but its identification is confirmed in AMSB (p 162), where Shore recounts the incident with Bell and equates the resultant work with a nude purchased by the NGV from his 1957 one-man show. Bella Donna, together with some other nudes completed during Shore's years at the school, will be considered in the next chapter.

The school also opened up the field of portrait painting to Shore. Apart from a few self-portraits painted during the twenties, Shore had painted very few portraits before the opening of the Bourke Street school.¹ His association

1 Two self-portraits (Plates 7 and 8) date from the early twenties. The 1929 one-man show included (cont. over)

with Bell gave him some modest social standing. Several of the students introduced to the school by Bell were middle-aged and elderly ladies of Toorak society. Shore's reticent charm, remarked upon by a number of the students interviewed by Eagle and Minchin and by other acquaintances of Shore's¹, appealed to older women; and he, now thirty-five years old and completely inexperienced with the opposite sex, found comfort in the company of women many years his senior.

Several of Shore's portraits of the mid-thirties are of titled women - Lady Barrett, Lady Baldwin Spencer, Lady Cresswell - and his earliest portrait commissions were a direct outcome of his association with the school. His first commission came in 1935 when Mr Justice Evatt, whose wife and son were students at the school, arrived at the Bourke Street studio with a suitcase containing his doctoral robes, and asked Shore to paint his portrait.²

(from previous page) two self-portraits (neither for sale) but either or both of these could date from an earlier period. Considering the difficulty Shore had in filling out the one-man exhibition it is likely that any self-portrait still in his possession was included. John Farmer had purchased the portrait in Plate 7, but there is no evidence to suggest that that in Plate 8 had been disposed of prior to 1929. The only other portraits he exhibited before 1932 were an unidentified portrait in the 1924 TMP exhibition and Ted with the same society in 1926.

- 1 In particular Arthur Frater, whose paint shop was established in the same building as the school, and whom Shore treated rather like a godson; from an interview with Arthur Frater, April 29, 1980.
- 2 AMSA, pl14. In Eagle and Minchin, op.cit., p250, Mary Alice Evatt's years of attendance are given as 1936-7, but this must refer to her tuition under Bell alone.

Lady Barrett had come to the school as a student when in her seventies. According to Shore, she soon became more interested in him personally than in the school's artistic theories, and developed a determination to advance him socially.¹ Shore believed that much of her interest in him stemmed from her loss of an only son in the first world war. The Barrett home was set in some three acres of ground in Toorak. Shore visited the Barretts frequently, and occasionally painted in the grounds, in which Australian native birds and animals, including a kangaroo, were kept as pets.² No extant work, however, can be identified as having been painted here.³

Shore's social greening under the auspices of Lady Barrett began during the first years of the school's existence⁴, and led indirectly to his loss of sexual innocence and the long-term relationship which he enjoyed during his years at Macedon. He may have attracted portrait commissions

- 1 AMSB, pp86f. At no stage does Shore refer to Lady Barrett by name, preferring the quaintly archaic Lady _____ in a chivalrous attempt to protect her good name. That the lady referred to is Lady Barrett is beyond doubt, as several acquaintances of Shore's from the thirties - in particular Tom Henderson and Arthur Frater - have attested to the amount of time he spent socially with her. Believing that he had shielded both Lady Barrett and her friend Mrs Lemann, with whom he developed a still closer relationship, by referring to them only anonymously, Shore in this later autobiographical manuscript had no hesitation in detailing his most intimate thoughts and actions involving them.
- 2 Recounted by Misses Jess and Mamie Mossman, close friends of both Shore and Lady Barrett during the thirties, in an interview, June 10, 1982.
- 3 Most of the few landscapes painted before Shore moved to Macedon have titles, but none of them mentions Helmuth or Palmyra, the two Lansell Road residences of the Barretts.
- 4 The uncommissioned portrait of Lady Barrett (Pl 80), dated 1933, must have been a direct result of their friendship.

by virtue of his artistic talents alone; but the names of his earliest sitters suggest that, at the very least, his introduction by Lady Barrett into Toorak society contributed to his attracting those commissions.

His friendship with her continued after the partnership with Bell had ended - she lent the dress worn in Reverie (Pl 105), painted in the South Yarra studio to which Shore moved after leaving the school. She played a considerable part in developing his social maturity and self-confidence; he was later to write, referring to the period when Bell was overseas: "Life was beginning at forty - or near enough to it - I was then about thirty eight."¹

Shore's four-and-a-half years at the school had profound effects on his private life and subsequent career. He entered the partnership at the age of thirty-four having led a sheltered, if not positively repressed existence, and left it at thirty-nine having gained immeasurably in confidence, professional standing, social contacts and experience in several new fields.

In 1931, before he approached Bell with his proposal, Shore was virtually unemployed, with slim prospects of re-employment. His financial position had grown critical. He was painting in a makeshift studio in the backyard of the home dominated by a demanding mother for whom he felt a responsibility which severely limited his opportunities to expand socially. He had had little experience with women,

¹ AMSA, 147. Shore turned thirty-eight in May 1935, while Bell was overseas.

and certainly none of a sexual nature.¹

Bell's trip to Europe gave Shore the opportunity to work as an art critic on a major daily newspaper. Criticism was to provide him with much of the regular paid employment he was to undertake throughout the rest of his life, and without this side-door introduction to reviewing it is probable that Shore would never have become a critic. His limited formal education (he left school at twelve) would have discouraged him from tackling professional writing, even if an editor prepared to overlook it could have been found.²

Another of Bell's duties which Shore took over was "a series of semi-private lectures on the history and appreciation of art" which Bell gave twice weekly. (AMSA, pl42) Shore reluctantly agreed to give these. His only previous experience of public speaking had been the lecture given in 1931 at the Herald exhibition of modern reproductions, and on that occasion he had suffered from acute nervousness. It is unlikely that he would voluntarily have ventured into the field of public speaking had it not been for the insistence of Basil Burdett on the first occasion and Bell on the next; yet, together with his activities as a critic, public speaking as a travelling speaker and guide for the National Gallery of Victoria was to provide his principal source of income after the war.

1 Shore specifically mentions his lack of experience with women at the time of Lady Barrett's interest in him in AMSB (p87).

2 Bell recommended Shore as his replacement to the editor of the Sun. The convenience of being provided with a ready-made stand-in for a limited period, and Shore's position as Bell's partner, no doubt swayed the editor not to question too closely Shore's experience and suitability. Shore was fortunate in having as a student Shelton Smith, the associate editor of the Argus, who volunteered to coach him for the job. (AMSB, pl06) Shore himself thought "it would be an interesting experience once I was over the initial stages of fright at the idea." (AMSA, 142)

A further opportunity to advance his reputation was provided by one of Shore's students. Mary Finnin had been appointed art mistress at Geelong Grammar School by the new and progressive headmaster, Dr James Darling. She regularly asked established artists to visit the school to exhibit their works and discuss them with the boys. Shore and Frater were both invited, and their exhibitions were timed to coincide with open days when parents (many of them wealthy and well-placed in Melbourne society) were in attendance. Shore made several sales as a result of his activities at the school.¹

It was during Bell's absence from the Bourke Street school that the most far-reaching changes were effected in Shore's personal and professional development. Apart from the reviewing and lecturing jobs which were thrust upon him, he received his first portrait commissions, his exhibited works began to sell to a wider public, and the NGV acquired the first of his works to enter a public collection. He still lived at home with his ailing mother, but the ministrations of her companion, Mrs Turton, freed Shore to enjoy more of the invitations which were coming his way.²

1 This information provided by Miss Finnin (now Mrs Mary Connellan) in an interview, May 28, 1980. She believed that some portrait commissions had resulted, but none of the portraits listed in Shore's sales book can decisively be connected with the school. Frater was commissioned, at Miss Finnin's suggestion, to paint Dr Darling's wife in 1935-6.

2 Shore had been elected a member of the T-square Club, a club for architects and artists, in November 1932. The club held monthly dinners which Shore attended, but while Bell was abroad he also began to receive invitations to private dinners and concerts. That this development could not have been before Bell left in July 1934 is indicated by Shore's comment that "my first dinner suit, quickly followed by full evening dress had to be obtained." (AMSA, pl47) At no stage in the early years of the school had his financial position been sound enough to entertain such purchases.

The change in Shore was apparent to Bell as soon as he returned. The partners had been in daily contact with one another prior to Bell's departure, and had come to know each other well. Bell's daughter, Mrs Antoinette Niven, recalls the startlingly different Shore who met them on the wharf on their return. He looked like "a polite stranger with a rolled umbrella and bowler hat. We were the ones who'd been to London!"¹ Bell's teaming with Shore did much for the younger artist personally and professionally; his going overseas did as much again.

Shore's relationship with Bell

Shore's initial approach to Bell in 1931 must have been undertaken with mixed feelings. The principal goad was financial necessity aggravated by some resentment that Bell was making money from his supposed standing as a modernist teacher. Shore was convinced that his understanding of modernism was superior to Bell's, and, whether as a vocation it appealed to him or not, teaching was the only way in which a knowledge of modern art could be turned to financial advantage.

Shore was well aware that Bell had a professional reputation far richer than his own, and that he had comparatively little to offer the partnership. He acknowledged his presumption in his letter to Bell suggesting a partnership. Some of Bell's reasons for accepting Shore's proposal - principally that Shore could take his place while Bell was overseas - have already been suggested. Bell's acquiescence did not

1 Quoted in Eagle and Minchin, op.cit., p40, from a taped interview with Mrs Niven.

completely remove the barrier which Shore felt between them - had felt during the twenties and was always to feel.

From his recorded references to Bell we can conclude that, apart from a reserved opinion of Bell's painting, Shore had the greatest respect for the older man's honesty and integrity. Bell, on his part, appears also to have had a high regard for Shore's painting and his ideas, at least in the early years of their association. Bell's newspaper reviews of Shore's exhibited works had been more tolerant than those of most other reviewers, and occasionally even enthusiastic. His expansive gesture of writing to Shore after the 1929 one-man show and, most importantly, his acceptance of Shore into partnership attest to a considerable opinion of his work. Furthermore, Shore wrote of Bell's attitude during the early years of the school that "he thought carefully over any suggestions I made as regards our teaching, and readily adopted most of them." (AMSA, pl20)

By 1934, when the school had been in existence for over two years, the two men could have expected it to be producing more profit than the one pound a week quoted by Shore. "Neither of [us] complained about the state of affairs," Shore wrote, "but we both felt rather disappointed." (AMSA, pl40) Shore had reason to be less disgruntled than Bell, and acknowledged this:

We had the use of the studio and models, of course, and also on the credit side, in my case, was the fact that a reputation was being made . . . Bell's reputation was already established, however; and he had a fine studio at home, and he was not as happy with the pupils. (AMSA, pl40)

Shore gives no further details about Bell's dissatisfaction with the pupils; it may simply have been symptomatic of a more general dissatisfaction with the school, and the frustration of having been so long thwarted in his desire to return to Europe.

When Bell decided to go abroad, after delaying so long, he did so almost on the spur of the moment, or so it seemed to Shore. "I'm off," he announced to his partner shortly before he departed, having already booked his passage. He left only enough time to introduce Shore to the several additional tasks with which he was then to be loaded. On Bell's return some sixteen months later, Shore, having expected a "giant refreshed," found instead that he seemed "not noticeably happier in spirit." (AMSA, p151)

The year following Bell's return to the school was not easy for either partner. Shore's painting style displayed no marked changes during Bell's absence; indeed he would have had little time to develop new theories or to experiment. Bell's outlook, on the other hand, more than his painting style, had altered radically. Shore wrote:

When it came to his turn to take charge of the classes, we taught fortnightly in turns, he initiated theories and practices quite opposed to our previous methods of teaching.¹

The aspect of these new practices which must most have concerned Shore was Bell's insistence that the students' palettes be restricted to red, blue and yellow only, in place of the full range of colours previously adopted.

1 AMSB, p109. Part of this section of AMSB is reprinted in Eagle and Minchin, op.cit., pp40-1.

If we accept the thesis advanced earlier that Bell's principal reason for entering into partnership with Shore was to provide himself with a 'housekeeper' during his absence, then any clash of methods and theories can be seen as part of Bell's eventual plan to rid himself of Shore. It may be overstating the case to suggest that Bell introduced these changes to be deliberately divisive; but any innovations which strongly conflicted with Shore's beliefs, as the restricted palette obviously would, were in Bell's long-term interests.

Shore could not understand the deterioration in their relationship, either at the time or in retrospect. In both of his autobiographical manuscripts he attempts to describe their personal differences in the last year of the partnership. There is no hint of bitterness, and little of recrimination.¹ The disparities in their teaching methods and theories would clearly have caused friction, but Shore, at least by his own account, accepted the changes. On the other hand, he did not necessarily incorporate Bell's theories into his own teaching, because he acknowledged the confusion that sometimes arose among students when one partner relieved the other.

Whatever his reasons, it was Bell who instigated the dissolution. When he bluntly broached the subject with Shore, after all the students had left one afternoon in September 1936, the reasons he gave were that the two of them were

1 "I do not blame myself in the least degree for what happened, but I have wit enough to realise that Bell would not blame himself either." (AMSA, p152) From the large number of students she and Jan Minchin interviewed for their book on Bell, Mary Eagle concludes that the students generally believed that Bell was responsible for the split, Eagle and Minchin, op.cit., p40.

no longer working together, and that he wished to teach his own pupils himself. Further discussion disclosed that Frater, immediately after Bell's return to Australia, had told Bell of the poor opinion which Frater and Shore held of Iain Macnab, the teacher under whom Bell had worked in London. Frater's tactlessness had transformed Shore's reservations concerning Macnab into a more positive lack of regard, at least in Bell's mind. The insult had rankled with Bell for nearly a year.¹

Bell also claimed to have noticed a change in Shore discernible in the letters he received in England. He would not expand on this alleged change, but the comment led Shore to believe that Bell had contemplated a dissolution even while he was in England. (AMSA, pl69) This tends to confirm the theory that Bell had viewed the partnership as temporary from the outset.

Other factors may have contributed to the eventual breakdown of the partnership, but they can equally be seen as aggravations stimulated by Bell's general dissatisfaction with the partnership. Shore has tentatively suggested jealousy on Bell's part at the success he enjoyed during Bell's absence², and this has been the reason most often suggested by those who knew both men at the time.³

1 AMSA, pp166-8. The AMSB extract reprinted in Eagle and Minchin, *op.cit.*, pp40-1, also recounts this explanation. Bell returned in October 1935.

2 "The idea does present itself that he may have almost resented my success because it constituted a bar to some programme he had formulated." (AMSA, pl56)

3 Virtually all those to whom the author has put the question of the reason for the rift have mentioned jealousy on Bell's part, although the cause of that jealousy has varied from Shore's painting skill, through the students' fondness for him, to his social success.

Bell openly expressed his dislike of some of Shore's friends (AMSA, p156; although unnamed, Frater would certainly have been one of these), and especially his friendship with Lady Barrett, whom Bell accused (to Shore) of trying to seduce him - a charge which Shore denies even in his sexually candid second autobiography. (AMSB, p87)

The proposed establishment of the Australian Academy of Art brought their disagreements to a head. William Rowell, one of the instigators of the proposal, had discussed it with Shore (a friend of some twenty years' standing), swearing him to secrecy. When word of the Academy reached Bell's ears, some months later, he savagely opposed it, and was particularly irate with Shore for not having told him of the preliminary discussions. He told Shore that if he "dared to join any Academy it would mean the end of our partnership." (AMSA, p164) This was the first indication given to Shore that Bell was contemplating a dissolution.

Aware of Bell's dissatisfaction, Shore made every attempt to avoid upsetting his partner during the last year they were together. Basil Burdett, who had become a close personal friend, had on more than one occasion asked Shore to give him private painting lessons, but Shore refused, to avoid offending Bell.¹ Mary Cecil Allen, with whom Shore had formed a friendship during Bell's absence, asked him to join with her in organizing a summer school for two weeks over the Christmas period of 1935. Again Shore declined,

1 AMSA, p158. As Burdett was art critic for the Herald he did not wish to attend the public classes. Shore believed that Bell would have been offended at Burdett's preference for him, and that he could legitimately have objected to Shore's taking a private student.

concerned that his acceptance would anger Bell.¹

He tolerated the reduced palette - comprising a "pure but common blue, in conjunction with an earth red and yellow ochre" - on which Bell had insisted on his return, despite the "awful messes of colour" which resulted. (AMSA, p155) One other aspect of Bell's revised teaching which Shore accepted with difficulty was the deliberate exaggeration and distortion of forms for the sake of design.

I was not afraid of, or unfamiliar with distortion.

The world's greatest artists used distortion in one way and another. But teaching distortion to students, almost as a primary principle, really shocked me. (AMSA, p155) This short quotation, perhaps more cogently than any other, seems to set the limits on Shore's modernism. Taken in conjunction with a comment on another innovation of Bell's - a set of two-dimensional studies² - it explains Shore's lack of sympathy with cubism, abstraction and surrealism.

This inability on Shore's part to appreciate many European developments of the preceding twenty years would have aggravated Bell's growing dissatisfaction with the partnership. That Bell was more receptive than Shore to new ideas is indicated in their respective reviews and articles, where Shore managed to suppress his prejudices less well than did Bell. Bell was aware that Shore's

1 "Considering his long spell abroad, I might have easily asked him, but I could not. It seemed as though anything I asked or did would be suspect. He might think I wanted to unduly influence some of our pupils who had announced their intention to attend the summer school." (AMSA, p157)

2 "The two-dimensional studies had been painted from still-life subjects, real or imagined; but the total exclusion of every suggestion of volume seemed abortive, and the results curious, that was all. Their value was problematical." (AMSA, p153)

knowledge of modernism was based primarily on reproductions, and was possibly even contemptuous of his partner's apparent lack of ambition to study overseas. It is hardly surprising that Bell did not take kindly to the reported criticism of his overseas experience from Shore and Frater, who had not been out of Australia since before the first world war.

Added to the disquiet between the partners were Bell's disapproval of the few portrait commissions which came Shore's way and his apparent inability to accept that Shore had matured - less as an artist than as an artistic personality. On one occasion, when ridiculing Burdett's suggestion that Shore should send some entries to an exhibition of the Sydney Society of Artists, Bell went so far as to refer to Shore as an "unknown youngster." When Shore's submissions were all accepted and, to make matters worse, he was elected to membership of the Society, Bell was greatly vexed.¹

On Bell's return to Australia, Shore had expected compliments and gratitude for the successful completion of his heavier duties. To his surprise and disappointment, instead of showing appreciation, Bell gave "an ever growing impression that he was acutely dissatisfied in some way." (AMSA, p156) The changes in Shore, and Frater's divulgence of their opinion of Macnab, are not sufficient reasons in themselves for Bell's alienation. Jealousy on Bell's part is too trite an answer. The fact that an uneasiness was evident from the time of his return, taken in conjunction

1 AMSA, p159. Shore was elected to the Society in September 1936, the month when the partnership was dissolved.

with the arguments previously advanced, supports the contention that, from Bell's point of view, Shore had served his purpose in taking over Bell's duties in his absence.

Bell's insulting comments, and failure to consult with his partner on changes to teaching policy, may have been the result of an irascibility deriving from the onerous liaison. They might also be seen as deliberate ploys to prompt Shore to quit the partnership; but Shore, still emotionally the subordinate, and having too much to lose by a dissolution, did not respond. Bell, much to Shore's surprise, bluntly asked for a dissolution of the partnership at the end of a working day in September 1936.¹

Shore's withdrawal from the school did him no harm professionally, and little financially. It was, however, with mixed feelings that he left the Bourke Street studio. Neither he nor Bell could bring himself to tell the students; together they composed a notice which was pinned up in the studio. Once the decision had been made - and the formal dissolution was signed only two days after Bell's shock announcement of his desire to end the partnership - Shore did not teach in the school again. For him

the next few days were sad ones. So much of my best had gone to the making of the school. I really loved the place. It had been my great hope for the future, and pleasure in the present. (AMSA, p173)

On the other hand, Shore reasoned that a change would do him good, and he could look forward to having all his time free

1 The circumstances in which the request for dissolution was made are outlined in the extract from AMSB reprinted in Eagle and Minchin, op.cit., p41.

for painting. His financial position was "fairly good," sufficient to live on for at least a year, even if he sold no paintings.¹

The two men parted amicably enough. After signing the dissolution they "went out and had a couple of drinks together" (Bell no doubt with an air of relief, if not celebration), and Shore acknowledged the fairness with which Bell settled their affairs.² Several of the female students who thought of themselves as Shore's students rather than Bell's "begged" him to start a school in opposition. Bell invited him, if he decided to start such a school, to advertise it with a notice in the studio. Shore went so far as to enquire about available studios, but found that the rental would be prohibitive, and finally decided that he "suddenly felt very tired of schools and teaching." (AMSA, pl72)

Having become accustomed to the facilities at the school, Shore could no longer accept the conditions in his backyard studio at home. Within two or three weeks he had found a new studio in South Yarra, on the first floor of 157 Toorak Road. The move marked the start of the period of Shore's greatest public success.

1 AMSA, pl70. This improvement in his finances was a direct effect of Bell's absence in Europe. Shore kept 75% of the school's takings in that period, and in addition had the fees for his reviews in the Sun as well as the income from sales of his paintings. He must nevertheless have exercised restraint in his expenditure to improve his situation so markedly in the two years since he had been forced to sell his car.

2 "As he had always been in all our relations except our recent disagreements." (AMSA, pl72)

The bitter feelings aroused in him by his enforced departure from the school continued to rankle for some time.¹ He realised, however, that his new situation had its advantages.

For the first time in my life I now had absolutely nothing else to do but paint. No trade work, no worry about the immediate economic state, no partners or pupils, no distractions at all except at home. (AMSA, p176)

His responsibilities at the school may have restricted his painting time and reduced his inclination to experiment, but following his move to the South Yarra studio in late 1936, Shore produced a body of work of such variety as to suggest it incorporated ideas formulated but not put into effect while he was working with Bell.

His decision to approach Bell had paid dividends which he could not have foreseen. He had hoped to find a means of supporting himself - a hope which was only partially realised - but his association with Bell provided a variety of experiences on which he was later to draw heavily. It also brought a measure of public acceptance and approval which boosted his self-esteem, allowing him to embark confidently on the next stage of his artistic development.

1 "I could not forget the studio and the break with Bell too easily. I missed the contact with pupils and friends, and bitter thoughts kept rising. I had been a fool to give way so quickly to Bell. He had been entirely regardless of my love for the school and the possible psychological effect of my retirement." (AMSA, p176)

CHAPTER FIVE

CONSOLIDATION - 1930-1938

At the beginning of the thirties, Shore could reasonably have laid claim to being Melbourne's leading modernist painter; there would have been few other contenders for the title. By the end of the decade, as a member of the basically reactionary Academy, he must have been seen by most of the younger artists who had banded together in the Contemporary Art Society as, at best, an equivocal figure.

Shore's modernism failed to keep pace with artistic developments in Melbourne during the thirties. He could not accept the tenets of cubism, surrealism or abstraction, and while these movements did not play a large part in the art of the thirties in Melbourne, they did begin to infiltrate the work of several younger artists.

While Thake and, later, Drysdale and Purves-Smith progressed towards a simplification of form reliant less on three-dimensional modelling than on clean, graceful lines, Shore was unwilling to discard the painterly methods of building up forms first taught to him by Meldrum, and modified by the examples of Cezanne and Van Gogh.

He continued to experiment, but principally within the confines of a style which he had forged by the beginning of the decade. Some of his most forceful and successful works date from the early thirties, but with few exceptions they represent a carefully considered extension of previously conceived ideas.

Now that current art periodicals and first class reproductions were readily available to him, it could have been expected that Shore's work would show more clearly evidence of European influences. However the very multiplicity of these potential sources of inspiration may well have overwhelmed Shore, still assimilating the lessons of the post-impressionists.

He vacillated between different styles, showing in individual works glimpses of an interest in a variety of modern European artists, without establishing any clear developmental direction. During 1930 and 1931 his confidence was adversely affected by the continuing downturn in the stained-glass trade, and then by the ill-judged gold-mining venture. At the Bourke Street school, the demands of teaching, his deference to Bell, and newly discovered social interests may all have contributed to an inability to work systematically towards any clearly defined artistic goal.

English artists were at least as influential as continental Europeans on Shore's work of the early thirties. This is largely attributable to the preponderance of English periodicals reaching Melbourne. Whether buying a magazine or browsing in the State Library, Shore would naturally lean towards those he could read, and English publications continued to reproduce primarily British art. Englishmen whose influence must be considered include Duncan Grant, Spencer Gore and, particularly, Matthew Smith.

Shore drew little from other Australian artists. The impetus which Horace Brandt had provided in freeing his technique had a lasting effect, and Frater provided welcome

moral support. Before 1932, however, no other Melbourne artist was sufficiently attuned to modernist ideas to arouse Shore's admiration or interest. From that time a succession of Melbourne artists began to grapple with modernist problems, but Shore made no overt acknowledgement of their advances, and chose not to follow their paths.

Several reasons for this can be suggested. Most of these artists were younger than Shore, and several were students of the Bell-Shore school. As their putative master, Shore consciously avoided the styles they adopted. His objections to the theories of cubism, surrealism and abstraction, which he imperfectly understood, recur at intervals throughout his autobiographies. It is significant that the Melbourne artists closer to his own age who were more receptive to these movements - Vassilieff and Fairweather in particular - had only recently arrived in Australia. Reproductions could lead Shore only so far; during the thirties his lack of overseas experience left him stylistically becalmed.

It is perhaps more surprising that his work showed few affinities with that of the longer-established Sydney modernist school. His still lifes and those of Margaret Preston shared some stylistic similarities during the mid-twenties, but they arose from common points of departure - post-impressionist reproductions in Shore's case and originals in Preston's - rather than from any apparent interaction between the two Australian artists.

Shore did not visit Sydney until the mid-thirties, and the paintings of Sydney artists were only spasmodically exhibited in Melbourne. It is virtually certain that the

pre-1920 works of Wakelin and de Maistre were not known to Shore during his years with Meldrum; if they had been, the monotone reproductions of post-impressionist work which he first saw in 1924 could hardly have surprised and excited him as they did. The work of these two artists from the late twenties and early thirties was not as innovative, and if Shore saw any of it during that time, it would have had less impact on him than did the colour reproductions arriving from Europe.

Grace Cossington Smith's work had achieved powerful maturity during this period, but her style was so distinctively individual that Shore, perhaps excessively wary of the hazards of imitation, would have hesitated to experiment with her prismatic approach. His knowledge of developments in Sydney probably came largely from copies of Art in Australia, the quality of whose reproductions lagged well behind European periodicals. Accepting his inability to travel to Europe, Shore saw a study of European reproductions as "the next best thing"; paintings by other Australians drawing on European influences would have been seen as one further remove from the fount of modernism, and their reproductions as still farther distanced.

The greatest barrier to Shore's development in any of the directions taken by European art since the turn of the century was his lack of appreciation of the motives underlying these multifarious movements. A thorough understanding would have been difficult enough for an educated man trained in the fields of philosophy, political theory and aesthetics, given Australia's distance from the

European arena and the paucity of lucid commentary emanating from it. For Shore, needing not only the background but also other interested artists who could provide encouragement and with whom the issues could be discussed, it was unattainable.

Frater was no theoretician, Burdett and Nibbi were not artists, Bell was unapproachable, Lawlor perorated on a different level; little wonder that Shore failed to establish an artistic philosophy consistent with any European movement or any advancing Australian trend. The thirties can be seen as a period during which he discarded influences rather than assimilated them. This process achieved, he could, by the end of the decade, sever connections with his Melbourne associates and their warring factions to concentrate on developing the independent style distilled through those eventful years.

During the twenties, Shore had challenged Melbourne's traditional view of what constituted acceptable artistic expression. His cries for recognition, not only for his own work but for a wholly new set of judgemental criteria, went largely unheeded, mainly because he was not crying loudly enough, to enough people, with a sufficiently authoritative voice.

His statements were made solely through his canvases, and his name was not known outside his own small artistic circle. Even within the ranks of the Twenty Melbourne Painters, Shore's work was considered eccentric. His paintings were displayed only to those members of the public who ventured into TMP exhibitions, and they were presented

without explanation or theoretical justification to viewers ignorant of the historical background which could have rendered the artist's aims comprehensible.

Shore was never a theoretician. He acquired the ability to express his ideas verbally and publicly only gradually and somewhat painfully during the thirties. Provided with a perfect opportunity, when invited to speak at the opening of the Herald exhibition of modern prints in 1931, Shore chose instead to give a tame and uncontentious account of the history of Australian painting (see p 192).

It was left to the more articulate Basil Burdett and Gino Nibbi to convince the art-aware of Melbourne that they should look beyond the reigning post-Heidelberg landscape tradition. These two men did more than any artist to engender the acceptance of modernism in Melbourne - but Shore's paintings gave them something concrete, and locally produced, with which to illustrate their arguments.

It was Nibbi who most strongly encouraged Shore to enter for the 1930 Salon d'Automne. Shore's success in having Ranunculus (Pl 63) accepted was a considerable achievement, but it created little interest in mid-depression Melbourne. It was not until the end of the following year that Melbournians openly began to express their interest in more progressive styles by flocking to Burdett's exhibition of modern reproductions.

Shore wrote that he was tempted to travel to Paris when the official Salon admission cards arrived (AMSA, p100B), but whether he gave serious thought to the trip is open to doubt. The cost of the fares, at a time when he was working

only on an irregular basis, would alone have been sufficient to dissuade him, even if he had been able to leave his mother.

Had he visited Paris, it is unlikely that his work would have been influenced as strongly as if he had made the trip in the middle twenties or earlier. By 1930 he was beginning to settle into a style with which he felt comfortable, and he would have been unsympathetic to much of the new work confronting him in Paris in 1930. He could more readily appreciate the reproductions available through Gino Nibbi, representing established modern artists rather than the truly avant garde.

Shore and Frater had become close friends of Nibbi's from shortly after the opening of his Leonardo Book Shop early in 1930. Both began to spend much of their spare time and money there. The only work specifically mentioned by Shore as having been bought in reproduction from Nibbi is Cezanne's 'Portrait of a Boy' - probably, from Shore's description, Boy in a Red Waistcoat in the Bührle Collection.

However, Tom Henderson brought with him, when he migrated to Australia in 1926, a high-quality reproduction of this same work which was definitely seen by both Shore and Frater.¹ The section of AMSA in which Shore describes his friendship with Nibbi and the 'facsimile prints' he sold falls between his description of Gamellias of 1926 and the account of his

1 The print was still in the possession of Mr Henderson in 1980, when it was seen by the author. Shore may have purchased another copy from Nibbi. The reproduction was certainly available, as a copy hung on the wall of the Bell-Shore school. It is clearly shown in Shore's The Class at Work (Pl 76), painted at the school in 1932. This copy may have been Shore's.

breakdown in the mid-twenties. Although Shore is vague about dates, this manuscript for the most part develops chronologically, and the context strongly suggests that he believed Nibbi's prints were known to him several years before 1930. This is confirmed in FYSF, where he lists the artists to whom he was introduced by Nibbi's magazines (see next page), describing them as "a heady mixture, back in the late nineteen-twenties."

It seems that Shore confused the influence of Nibbi's prints and other reproductions which were available earlier, including Tom Henderson's Cézanne print. It would be a mistake to place too much importance on Nibbi's reproductions, apart from those of Van Gogh which will be considered separately. While the prints were undoubtedly of a higher quality than most Shore had seen before, and could consequently have had a greater impact, the reproductions and the styles they exemplified had been accessible for some years through periodicals and books, at least some of which Shore had certainly seen. He could not otherwise have produced, in particular, Back Yard Idyll and The Circus.

The same applies to the French magazines Cahiers d'Art and Formes, to which Shore subscribed through Nibbi.¹ Most of the illustrations (all of those in Cahiers d'Art) were in black-and-white, and the artists represented were those who had already safely established their names. The illustrations accompanying the articles (none of which he could read)

1 Whether Shore actually subscribed to the magazines or simply purchased them from Nibbi's shop is not clear. In AMSA (p114) he uses the term 'subscribe', but in FYSF he writes only that he obtained them through Nibbi.

could extend Shore's knowledge of the work of certain French masters, but could hardly be revelatory.

In *Forty Years Seek and Find*, Shore has written of the effect of these magazines: "So I learned of Modigliani, Soutine, Braque, Picasso, Gromaire, Dufy, Rouault, Chagall - a heady mixture, back in the late nineteen-twenties." But of these only Soutine and Gromaire could have been unknown to him in 1930.

Gromaire can be ignored as an influence; to Shore, always lacking enthusiasm for cubism and its offshoots, especially at a time when his leanings were increasingly towards rich colours spread generously onto the canvas, Gromaire's work (particularly reproduced in black-and-white) would have seemed arid and passionless. Soutine's works lose a great deal in black-and-white reproduction, but their vigour and freedom are still apparent, and they could have helped confirm Shore's belief in experiments he continued to make in a more freely handled style.

The general public of Melbourne received its first concerted exposure to modern European art in the exhibition of reproductions organized by Basil Burdett in December 1931. Financed by Keith Murdoch, the show was mounted in the Assembly Room of the Herald building.

Burdett also planned a series of lectures to accompany the exhibition, and asked Shore to deliver one of them. Although he had never before spoken in public,

Shore agreed, believing that "such a lecture would be good for me, our school, and modern art." (AMSA, p118) If Shore's reasons are accepted in full, this places his first discussions with Bell no later than November 1931, as the exhibition opened on December 2.

Shore admitted to a severe, if understandable, attack of nervousness on this occasion. (AMSA, pp118-9) His thorough preparation, however, saw him through the ordeal, and the experience gave him confidence to accept similar engagements over the next few years. A full handwritten copy of the text of his 1931 lecture has survived¹, but it unfortunately throws no light on his attitudes to the European masters represented in the exhibition, being no more than a survey of Australian art from Glover to Meldrum.

The exhibition itself would have had little effect on Shore. Despite Bernard Smith's belief, it is unlikely that any original paintings were exhibited. Professor Smith has written: "Apart from colour reproductions of work by Cézanne, Van Gogh and Gauguin, the exhibition included original work by Matisse, Picasso, Utrillo, Dufy and Modigliani."² In drawing this conclusion, he has almost certainly placed an understandable but erroneous interpretation on Basil Burdett's account of the exhibition.

1 In Mrs Shore's possession. Although the manuscript is not dated, it can be identified from the closing sentences stating that Frater and Bell will continue the series.

2 Australian Painting, p207.

In an article for Art in Australia surveying the year 1931 in Melbourne, Burdett paid credit to Keith Murdoch for organizing the exhibition, modestly neglecting to mention his own role. He continued:

Inquiries were made and it was found possible to secure a representative collection of excellent large colour facsimiles of the work of Cézanne, Van Gogh and Gauguin, the leaders of French Post-Impressionism. Individual works by later painters - Matisse, Picasso, Utrillo, Dufy, Modigliani, were also available, as well as a number of prints by the Impressionists, Manet, Renoir, Degas, Monet, Sisley and Pissarro.¹

Burdett's term 'individual works' does not refer to original paintings, but to a single reproduction representing each of the five 'later painters', distinguishing them from Cézanne, Van Gogh and Gauguin, each of whom was represented by 'a representative collection' of prints.

That Burdett's article is the source of Smith's information is suggested by the order in which the artists' names are listed. Blamire Young, in his review of the exhibition in the Herald², made no mention of original paintings - an extraordinary omission, if any originals were included, to be made by the critic for the newspaper organizing the exhibition. On the contrary, he wrote: "if these works were genuine originals the collection would be of fabulous value."

1 Burdett, B., 'Art in Melbourne', Art in Australia, Series 3, No 42, February 1932, pp10-11.

2 Herald, December 1, 1931, p8. This review was published on the day prior to the exhibition's opening.

Young also stated in his review that the collection contained examples of the work of fifteen artists, fourteen of whom are listed in Burdett's article. Impressionist and post-impressionist works dominated the show. Works by the 'later painters' named by Burdett had been liberally reproduced in magazines available to Shore during the twenties and early thirties.

Furthermore, the probable source of most of the prints was Gino Nibbi, who had started the controversy which led to the exhibition. Many of the prints borrowed from private owners would originally have come from Nibbi, who had been the first to import them on a commercial scale. Through his friendship with Nibbi, and his interest in the prints, Shore would already have seen most of them on their arrival at Nibbi's shop.

The exhibition may have shown Shore nothing new, but, together with the newspaper controversy which preceded it, it helped to engender an unprecedented awareness of 'modern art' among members of the public. Burdett relates that "the number of visitors was many times greater [than] that at any art show in Melbourne for many years." The token representation of twentieth century masters, however, underlines just how far Melbourne still had to go in catching up with developments in the rest of the world.

Shore's work during the early and middle thirties will be treated in three categories: flowerpieces, figure studies and portraits. The first is by far the most numerous; the other two comprise all but a handful of the studies of the human figure completed by Shore during his career. A small

number of further works which fall into none of these categories will, however, be considered first.

Penleigh Boyd's Studio (Pl 65), painted in 1930, boasts a spontaneity and freedom comparable to the best of Shore's painting from the twenties. Shore did not consider it a finished work - it is unsigned (rare at any period) and the sales book records it as a 'sketch' which was sold to Mrs Tweddle for only two guineas.¹

There is a striking similarity between the tree on the right of this painting and that in Back Yard Idyll (Pl 32). Its shape is the same, down to the curve in the trunk. The same firm outlines delineate the trunk and branches, although the foliage is softer, having been swept in with strokes applied more loosely than the jabbings of paint in the earlier picture. This work adds weight to the hypothesis that Back Yard Idyll, with which it has much in common, was not destroyed until after 1930.

From this time, most of Shore's paintings are more carefully finished, and only an occasional example from the next few years achieves the freshness of Penleigh Boyd's Studio. Only two other landscapes are known to have survived from the early thirties. Special Washing (Pl 85) will be considered in conjunction with Melbourne's Oldest Chef (see p 229), and Maldon (Pl 111) in relation to the landscapes of the Macedon years in the next chapter.

¹ It is still in Mrs Tweddle's family, belonging to one of her grandsons. The date of 1930 is inscribed on the reverse in Shore's hand, and the sales book includes it among those works sold 'before 1931'. The cottage itself, at Warrandyte, was destroyed in the bushfires of 1939.

The only other known work from 1930 is a pencil drawing, The Speech (Pl 66), showing Frater, standing in the top right corner, addressing a group seated or standing around a cake with candles. On the back of the framed drawing, in the artist's hand, is an inscription which exposes several of Shore's prejudices simultaneously:

Memory drawing of Frater making a speech to the guests at a Party given by Mr and Mrs Newmark at Alphington (or Fairfield Park) 1930. Audience Bolshies, Intelligentsia & Wealthy Jews.

The sketch, executed with thick strokes of a soft pencil, displays a vitality which Shore had begun to temper in some of his oils.

The individual faces, many of which would seem to be recognizable portrait sketches, have attentive expressions, but the lines which constitute their bodies and the spaces between them abound with an energy which gives an extraordinary sense of movement to the drawing. Frater's face, immediately recognizable, surmounts a body skilfully set apart from the *mêlée* of the other guests, making it the natural focus of attention.

The house of Mr Aaron Newmark at 331 Heidelberg Road and the large studio he had built behind it provided an important meeting place for a number of Melbourne artists in the early thirties. Newmark had made his money as a highly regarded, independent consultant to the wine-making industry, having taught himself oenology.¹ Newmark himself

1 Interview with his son, Mr Ariel Newmark, May 9, 1980. For more information on Newmark and his studio see Wynn, Allan, The Fortunes of Samuel Wynn, Cassell, 1968.

painted, favouring fantastic and allegorical subjects, a high-keyed palette, and a somewhat tortured, expressionistic style.

The artists who frequented the studio - including Shore, Frater and Lawlor - availed themselves not only of the excellent painting conditions but also of Newmark's copiously stocked cellar. The artists chipped in to hire models which they would have been unable to afford individually. The studio had a glass roof and frosted glass walls; Newmark's son Ariel recalls scraping away some of the frosting to obtain his first view of a nude.

Unlike Frater, who lived within walking distance of Newmark's studio and used it regularly¹, Shore must have painted there only on rare occasions. He makes no mention of Newmark or his studio in his manuscripts, and he admitted to Bell late in 1931 that he had never painted from the nude.

Frater and other artists who used Newmark's studio and enjoyed his hospitality expressed their appreciation by presenting him with paintings, but the only Shore which the sales book records going to Newmark (and the only one now in his son's possession) is Metamorphoses (Pl 70), which was bought from the 1931 Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition for ten guineas, the full catalogue price. The sales book lists paintings which Shore gave away as well as those he sold.

1 Frater's association with Newmark was close and extended over several years. He is seen as the central figure in Shore's pencil drawing of 1930, suggesting that he was then a particular friend of the Newmarks', and over the next few years he painted portraits of Newmark's wife (probably in 1934-5) and his son Ariel. Frater also gave Newmark two of his landscapes, both of which are still in his son's possession.

According to Ariel Newmark, who inherited Metamorphoses from his father, the arrangement of the subject occurred accidentally when the red mask fell from the wall where it had been hanging onto the apples and bananas beneath it. The juxtaposition of mask and fruit no doubt reminded Shore of similar combinations in the still lifes of Cézanne. He has responded by choosing less brilliant colours and applying them sparsely to produce a painting more reminiscent of Cézanne than any other work of this period. Shore's economical application of colour to the fruit, however, causes the apples especially to lack the solidity of Cézanne's fruit.

Metamorphoses is the only extant still life from this period not to feature flowers, and is one of very few non-floral still lifes completed by Shore during his career. If the term 'still life' is understood to exclude flower studies, only three earlier examples are known: Jug and Jar (Pl 3, discarded by the artist and rescued by chance), Mandarins (Pl 9, probably arranged and painted at Meldrum's instigation), and Chinese Figure (Pl 10, painted immediately after receiving news of his father's death). The only later still life is the quite atypical work from 1940 now in the Art Gallery of New South Wales (Pl 136).

Flowerpieces

His avoidance of inanimate still life serves to heighten the importance to Shore of the floral arrangement as subject matter. In the last half of his career his overwhelming concern was for the living forms of the bush. Flowers in

a vase, especially as Shore painted them, were less than one remove from living organisms. The vitality which Shore's best works express so urgently is sufficient explanations for his predilection for flower studies. Other reasons, however, can also be found.

There are obvious and universal advantages in still life, and particularly flowers, as subject matter. The compositional elements can be selected, discarded and arranged at will, providing an almost limitless variety of local colour, texture and form. Flowers are readily and cheaply available, are more accommodating than human models, and more accessible than new landscapes.

Flowers, though, had an especial fascination for Shore. In the middle of his account of his first breakdown in the mid-twenties, Shore recalls a habit of his childhood:

When quite young I had often suffered from terrors at night. I had then invented a simple way of regaining peace of mind. I'd imagine myself in a garden of beautiful flowers, flowers of every conceivable colour. Through this garden I'd walk in fancy, concentrating on all the lovely colours. Comfort and rest usually followed. (AMSA, pp74-5)

Flowers could always afford him this solace. A comparable reaction to real flowers was noticed by nurses attending him during one of his last bouts of depression. Whenever flowers were brought into his hospital room, Shore's often vocal mental anguish would be immediately dissipated. His skill in arranging these flowers in a vase was remarkable, and seemingly instinctive. Flowers played a positive role

in rehabilitating him then and on other earlier occasions.¹ When he painted flowers, they were treated not simply as still life objects, but rather as organisms for which he had a genuine regard bordering on reverence.

In this he differed in his attitude to the subject from the French impressionists and all those who followed them. Charles Sterling has contended that the impressionists developed a new concept of still life - one devoid of every trace of sentimental allusion.² Cézanne and, increasingly, twentieth century masters took a starkly objective view of their still life subjects, concentrating for this reason on inanimate objects and simple geometrical shapes. The shapes themselves, and their surface textures, lost importance and identity.

Shore, by comparison, always retained the inherent shape of his floral subjects, and took pains to convey their textures. The mild distortions he introduced, and his considered omissions of detail, were intended always to enhance the liveliness of his subject. Although he utilized certain modernist devices, most particularly the freedom to improvise, he did so towards an end quite different from his European predecessors'.

One characteristic of Shore's flower studies from the twenties and early thirties which they share with most

1 Recalled by Mrs Shirley Merry, who attended Shore in hospital during the early sixties, and confirmed by Mrs Shore.

2 Sterling, C., Still Life Painting from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century (2nd revised ed.), Harper & Row, N.Y., 1981, p125.

post-impressionist and later European examples is their concentration on a single variety of flower. The traditional floral still life prior to 1875 (the date given by Sterling as that from which still life was no longer considered an inferior genre¹) boasted a variety of species, providing the artist with an opportunity to display the breadth of his representational skills. As forms and compositions were gradually simplified through the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, a tendency towards a single species and fewer colour variations emerged in flower painting.

Van Gogh, in particular, recognized the impact and power imparted by concentration on a single colour (Pl 48, and his series of sunflowers). Van Gogh was to influence Shore increasingly from the early thirties, but Shore's preference for a single variety of flower dates back to 1924 and his earliest modernist experiments. Even before this date Shore did not favour great variation within a floral arrangement (Plates 13, 14, 15). This may be seen as a legacy of Meldrum's classes, where simplicity in compositions was encouraged.

Simplicity and freedom of handling are features of two of Shore's most successful flower studies from the early thirties. In Ranunculus (Pl 63), the successful Salon exhibit, a timely interruption contributed to these characteristics. Shore has described this work and the circumstances of its execution in some detail in AMSA (p100B).

1 Sterling, op.cit., p148.

It was

 painted quickly one Sunday morning . . . Noting how the dark centres conformed to a simple pattern of emphases, I quickly set down these darks, using an old reprimed canvas, and then lightly suggested with a few lines and pale washes of colour, the other elements of the picture. The mater then called me to morning tea. I took my painting with me, to have a look at it in a frame while I drank my tea. To my great surprise it looked almost complete. I had the sense to do very little more to it.

 A comparison of Ranunculus with earlier flowerpieces suggests that Shore had already begun to temper some of his more aggressively modern stylistic devices. Where the petals in Flowers (Pl 33) of 1927 were firmly outlined with dark strokes, the ranunculi petals are outlined in fluid, ephemeral lines which emphasize their delicacy. The integration of the picture space which was a feature of Rhododendrons (Pl 40) of 1929 is achieved more subtly in Ranunculus through the merging of shadows, the introduction of a mirror surface and reflection, and the tendency of the brushstrokes composing the tablecloth to float above the surface.

 There is a suggestion of the influence of Redon in the fragile, almost ethereal quality of the flowers. The planar colours of Matisse and Gauguin have been discarded, and there is nothing of the solidity of Cézanne or Van Gogh in the forms.

 The European artist to whose work Ranunculus most closely approaches, however, is Duncan Grant. In works such as Still Life (Pl 64) of c1915 Grant built up his surfaces

with a succession of short, nervous brushstrokes resulting in an airy, shimmering picture space very similar to that achieved by Shore in his Salon entry.

None of Shore's subsequent flower studies was to be as loosely structured. Two works from the following year (Plates 68, 69) appear to have been approached in a similar manner, but are more formally finished and lack the immediacy of Ranunculus.

Convulvulus (Pl 67), also painted in 1931, bears a closer resemblance to Ranunculus. No superficial background detail is allowed to detract from the impact of the flowers, and the delicacy of the petals is achieved using thin films of flat, bright blue paint heightened by filaments of mauve. Convulvulus was given to the Miss Leviny who had already purchased Red Camellias.¹ It is quite possible that she had expressed approval of the sketch-like quality of Red Camellias (Pl 35), and especially requested that Convulvulus be left under-finished.

In other flowerpieces from 1931, Shore has attempted to combine Van Gogh's richly textural application of paint with the integration of the picture space which had begun to interest him in the late twenties, and which is particularly evidenced in Rhododendrons of 1929. This unification of different sections of the picture was achieved more subtly in Ranunculus, possibly fortuitously,

1 Both works are recorded in the sales book together under sales 'before 1931'. It is more likely that the two works were grouped for convenience, with Shore's memory of dates slightly at fault, than that the work itself is incorrectly dated.

and it was a concern of Shore's in most of his flower studies of the early thirties.

In both Still Life with Lilies (Pl 68) and, more particularly, Cannas (Pl 69) the elements of flowers, vase, supporting and background surfaces are drawn together through the application of short, multi-coloured brushstrokes in the closest approach Shore was to make to a neo-impressionist style. Frater had used a comparable technique, but applied with much greater freedom, a few years earlier in Olympus (Pl 21), and maintained it especially in the backgrounds to his portraits and nudes of the thirties.¹

Van Gogh's increased influence on Shore's work dates from his discovery of Nibbi's bookshop. The reproductions available there are unlikely to have introduced Shore to artists of whom he was previously unaware; however, by virtue of their superior quality - their closer approximation to the appearance of the originals - they could further his admiration for European artists whose reputations were firmly established.

The reproductions were expensive; Shore remembered their costing "three or four guineas each" (AMSA, p72), the price he had asked for his own drawings in the one-man exhibition. But he believed that his expenditure on prints and books was justified, as they provided him with the "next best thing" to travelling to Europe to study modernism.

1 Justin Gill recalls Frater's teaching him in the early thirties to use a cross-hatching technique for backgrounds to nudes, recommending that no detail be shown, "just patches of any tones at all, criss-crossing." From an interview with Gill, April 29, 1981.

Several Van Gogh prints were soon in my possession - lovely studies of flowers, and landscapes of writhing wheat fields, with cyprus [sic] trees rhythmically columned to the sky - paintings animated with an intensity which rivalled that of Nature, rather than copied it. I loved Van Gogh's use of paint. Robust technique had always attracted me, from the days of a youthful admiration of Frank Brangwyn to those of worship of Rembrandt. It was easy to transfer this interest to Van Gogh and revel in his use of thick, living paint. (AMSA, p71)

The large-scale, high resolution reproductions sold by Nibbi accurately conveyed Van Gogh's sensuous application of rich impasto, only hinted at in the reproductions with which Shore had hitherto been familiar.

It was not until the landscapes of the late thirties and forties that Shore was to realise the full potential of brushes fully laden with rich pigments. In these later studies he could allow himself the extravagance of a long sweeping stroke with a loaded brush in the trunk of a tree, a stretch of road, or a roof line. The flower studies of the early thirties provided less scope for such expansive gestures. Compared with the flowerpieces of Van Gogh, who could apply his lush paint with unerring precision and economy of means, those of Shore's in which he most clearly attempts to follow Van Gogh's example suffer from an excess of strokes resulting in an overly busy picture surface (Pl 68).

The European artist of whose work Shore's flowerpieces of the early thirties are most reminiscent is Matthew Smith. In Smith's Lilies (Pl 71) of 1913-14, as in Shore's Still Life with Lilies, there is an uneasy serenity achieved through tentative, carefully controlled distortions and extrapolations of natural features. The surface calm veils a vaguely sensed underlying turbulence.

A parallel could be drawn between these paintings and the characters of the artists. Both were reserved to the point of shyness¹, and both suffered from occasional bouts of severe depression and self-doubt. In their later careers the similarity of style is even more marked. Smith's vigorous landscape technique in works such as Winter Landscape, Frejus (Pl 137) of c1935 is very close to that used by Shore during the war and in later years. Smith's work was extensively reproduced in English art magazines of the twenties and thirties, and he must be seen as an important influence on the development of Shore's mature style.

A list of the works exhibited by Shore throughout the twenties shows that the overwhelming majority were flower studies. By the early thirties, the titles of his exhibited works show greater variety, reflecting his expanding social contacts and the new flexibility of his painting time, but flowerpieces still form a major proportion. Perhaps more importantly, Shore's sales book for the years from 1931, when he began keeping accurate records, until

1 Rothenstein, J., Matthew Smith, Beaverbrook, London, 1962, p2.

1936, when the partnership with Bell broke up, shows that the great majority of his sales, and virtually all the major works sold, were flower studies.

Their popularity no doubt influenced him to persevere with flowers as subjects. The most important reason for his continued concentration on flower studies, however, was their suitability as media for his artistic strengths. Not only did they allow him to give free rein to his flair for colour and his broad and vigorous brushwork - they also were not as demanding on the drawing skills which he believed he lacked.

The flower paintings could be expected to provide the clearest indication of Shore's stylistic development from the twenties into and through the thirties. Not only have they survived in sufficient numbers (we have at least one flowerpiece from each of the years from 1926 through to 1940), but they display an inherent consistency of composition and structure which should enable comparisons more readily to be made.

Despite a consistency of style and basic format, Shore managed to maintain a freshness in each new composition attributable to a willingness to experiment with many varieties of flower, and his flair for arrangement. Shore did not allow his fondness for rich colours to restrict him to vividly coloured blooms; due attention is paid to

1 For these years, 33 sales are recorded, of which 24 are flowerpieces. Of the remaining nine, most are sketches sold for three guineas or less, and the most expensive is Metamorphoses (Pl 70) bought by Aaron Newmark for ten guineas. Commissioned portraits have not been included in these figures.

delicately shaded varieties and, especially in the late thirties, to interestingly textured Australian natives.

The tendency seen in some of Shore's earlier flower studies to integrate the principal subject with its surroundings is still strongly evident in Roses (Pl 89) of 1932. Flowers, vase, foreground and background are more fully unified than in any known earlier work. Shore has here swung well away from the precise delineation of post-impressionist flowerpieces (Plates 47, 48), incorporating elements from a variety of European sources.

The colours, though close to those of nature, have the vividness of fauvist works, and have been applied in a correspondingly free manner. The cursory concern for three-dimensionality and the uniformity of emphasis throughout the composition show that Shore retained an admiration for Matisse's work, and suggest an increased familiarity with, if not enthusiasm for, later European developments in which traditional spatial illusion was completely discarded.

The crowded surfaces of Roses and other works from the early thirties (Plates 68, 72) were gradually to give way to less cluttered compositions as Shore began to eliminate subsidiary detail, especially in his flowerpieces. The force of the 1932 Flower Study (Joseph Brown collection, Pl 88) rests in the stark contrasts between orange-red flowers and jug, near-black leaves heightened by streaks of colour, and richly textured white background. This work, with its vivid colours and rich impastos, epitomises the freedom which Shore believed he lost, to some extent, under Bell's influence.

In most subsequent studies, background and supporting surfaces are painted in neutral colours with interest being maintained through textural variations and gentle gradations of tone. The brilliant colours of Plates 88 and 89 are gradually subdued over the next few years, through studies such as those illustrated in Plates 90 to 92, to the earthier tones of the Australian natives which predominate in the late thirties.

The first painting completed after Shore's break with Bell was another Roses (Pl 93), which was to share the Herald prize for the best picture exhibited in 1937.¹ Roses was Basil Burdett's outright choice for the prize, and this decision was supported by several other artists he consulted (including Bell), but Sir Keith Murdoch, then managing director of the Herald, insisted that the prize of fifty pounds be shared between Shore and Sir John Longstaff for his Grey Evening.² Murdoch was not antipathetic to Shore's less traditional style; later in the same year he and his wife were to buy three major works from Shore's one-man exhibition at the Athenaeum Gallery.³

- 1 The painting was completed in 1936 but not exhibited until March 1937 in Shore's one-man show at Sydney's Macquarie Galleries. It was also exhibited in the Group 12 show in June 1937. The Herald award was announced in March 1938.
- 2 AMSB, pp15-6. In a further reference to this incident in his scrapbook, Shore writes that, when Burdett asked Bell for his opinion, "Bell, though he was very hostile to me at this time, said BB had made [the] only possible decision." The exhibition which Burdett organized in conjunction with the prize - 'Outstanding Pictures of 1937' - also included Shore's The Garden, Nandi.
- 3 Shore's sales book records Flowers (at 50 guineas the highest priced work to sell) and Black Forest (now in the Warrnambool Art Gallery) being bought by Sir Keith, and Spring Flowers going to Lady Murdoch.

Even allowing for a darkening of the surface with time, Roses is painted in more sombre colours than Shore had used in his earlier flowerpieces. He chose roses which he described as "unorthodox blooms, pink and lemon white buds with outer petals of a darkish purple brown quality." (AMSA, p175) Burdett, who some years earlier had admired (and been given) the dark-toned Cannas (Pl 69), referred in describing Roses to "the restrained splendour of its colour scheme," and called it "by far the best flowerpiece Arnold Shore has yet painted."¹

One aspect of Roses which Shore retained in several later flowerpieces was the dark background. It can be seen in Pink Roses (Pl 95) of 1938, where it highlights by contrast the glowing pale pinks and whites of the flowers, and in a number of studies of Australian natives whose less vivid colours are suited by an unobtrusive dark background (Pl 96). In Tiger Lilies (Pl 97) of 1942, the background fulfils both functions, blending the autumnal tonings of the leaves and providing a contrast with the brilliant whites of the lilies.

The increased interest which Shore showed in native flowers from the mid-thirties² was almost certainly influenced by Margaret Preston's work, and encouraged by a favourable public response to his own attempts. Flowering Gum (Pl 98), exhibited at the 1935 Group 12 exhibition, was purchased by Mrs Percy Grainger, and was

² Prior to 1935 the only record of a recognizably Australian flower is Hakea, shown with the TMP in 1932

¹ Review of 'Outstanding Pictures of 1937', Herald, March 1, 1938, p3.

chosen to be illustrated in the Sun.¹ Banksias (Pl 99) was bought by Mrs R.G. Casey, one of Shore's strongest supporters, from his first group of exhibits with the Sydney Society of Artists, and was illustrated in colour in Art in Australia.² Another painting of Banksias, purchased from the 1937 one-man show in Sydney, was presented to the Queensland Art Gallery in that year to become the first Shore in a public gallery outside Victoria.

Preston and Shore were attracted to Australian natives for different reasons. For Preston, in her expressed aim of helping to develop a specifically Australian art, indigenous varieties were a natural starting point. Moreover, the regular, almost geometrical shapes of several native flowers, particularly banksias, appealed to her more fully developed appreciation of the geometrical forms of cubism. Their less brilliant colours also made them suitable subjects for experimentation in a style in which colour played only a subsidiary role.

Shore was more interested in the varied textural qualities of Australian natives. To capture the bristly surface of a banksia bloom or a multi-faceted gum-blossom was a challenge of a technical as much as of an artistic kind;

1 Sun, June 25, 1935, pl3. In the exhibition the picture was entitled Ficifolia. Group 12 first exhibited in 1935; its members were Shore and eleven students from the Bourke Street school. Others exhibiting by invitation were all associated with the school. Significantly, the group was formed in Bell's absence. Shore continued to exhibit after the partnership dissolved, and Bell also exhibited by invitation, but understandably the group was short-lived, the final exhibition being held in 1938.

2 Art in Australia, Series 3, No 64, August 1936, p61.

to meet it he was prepared to experiment with a wide variety of approaches. Of the Banksias now in Brisbane Shore wrote: "This study was thickly painted, partly because I had found this the only way to suggest the bottle-brush texture of the banksias." (AMSA, p182) The Brisbane Gallery was forced to place glass over the painting to prevent children from trying to pick off "the little excrescences of paint." (AMSA, p182)

Shore found another, quite different way to represent the bottle-brush texture in a further study of banksias (Pl 100).¹ Here the bristles are indicated with short strokes of bright red applied with a dry brush so that the light underpainting shows through small irregular gaps in the brushstroke. The feathery effect so produced contrasts with the rich dark green of the densely massed central leaves, dashed in with a fully-loaded brush. The result is a work as fresh and vigorous as any Shore painted.

A slightly earlier flowerpiece, Camellias (Pl 103), was the first Shore to be purchased by a public gallery.² Following its exhibition at the Twenty Melbourne Painters show in September 1937, it was recommended to the trustees of the National Gallery of Victoria by the director, J.S.Macdonald. After some months, during which Macdonald was sent to Shore's studio in an attempt to find "a more representative work," the recommendation

1 This work is dated, but the last digit could be 2, 7 or 9. Both 1937 and 1939 are plausible dates, but the more likely is 1937. The flowerpieces from that time (especially those depicting the more traditional varieties) begin to take on a more formal character.

2 His chalk drawing of a nude had been presented to the NGV by Daryl Lindsay; Queensland Art Gallery's Banksias was also a gift.

was accepted.¹

Shore wrote that "this painting would have provided an interesting contrast to that other study of Camellias which Adrain Lawlor had owned." (AMSA, p183) As far as can be judged from the clear black-and-white photograph of the earlier work in Shore's scrapbook (Pl 27) and his own description of it, the differences were not as great as the artist may have liked to believe. The new study was "richer in colour, paint quality and technique," he wrote. "Much of it was painted with a palette knife, in broad sweeps." (AMSA, 183) But in describing the earlier Camellias, Shore mentioned the "bold red and white of the flowers, set in the glossy dark of their leaves," adding that "the colours were applied richly to the canvas, with a few lines here and there to suggest character and modelling." (AMSA, p70)

There is certainly a greater freedom of paint application in the later work, and forms are less precisely delineated; but the modelling is more tonal, and the elements of the composition more formally and conventionally arranged. More than ten years had elapsed between the execution of the two paintings, and in that time critical reaction to less traditional modes of expression had greatly mellowed, but Shore's later version now looks decidedly less 'modern', if rather more accomplished, than that from the mid-twenties. Its acceptance by the NGV trustees can hardly be seen as

1 AMSA, p183. Also recounted with more detail by Shore in an article about the painting in Australasian Post, July 10, 1952, p13.

a victory for modernism. The extent of Macdonald's reactionary outlook has been exaggerated, but he was far from sympathetic to the most advanced work. That it was Macdonald who recommended the purchase of Camellias is a clear indication that Shore's work was no longer in the forefront of progressive art in Melbourne.

Figure Painting

By 1931 the lingering effects of the depression had left Shore in a precarious situation. In his painting, too, he had reached a temporary impasse. Most of his still lifes of that year lack both the joyous sense of freedom in experimentation which infused his best work of the twenties, and the assurance which was to grow gradually over the next few years. He had dabbled with aspects of the styles of Matisse, Van Gogh and Cézanne without fully understanding their aims. Having been exposed to their influences, and those of other artists who followed them, in a haphazard, unorganized manner, he could not disentangle any consistent thread of development, and his own experiments lacked any clear direction.

An abrupt break was called for. In his private and professional life it came with the decision to start the Bell-Shore school; in his painting it came with an attempt at a totally new subject - a vast, milling crowd of people - inspired by a rehearsal of Ravel's Bolero at Melbourne University's Melba Hall.¹

1 According to a letter from Shore to the AGNSW at the time of the Gallery's purchase of the painting in 1962. The letter is in the files of the AGNSW library.

Ravel's Bolero (Pl 72) is an exultant symphony of colour. With the exceptions of the conductor and the solitary musician in the upper left corner, the middle and background figures merge together in a rich fabric representing, rather than people, the carnival atmosphere of the occasion. The short brushstrokes of rich primary colour in the upper section unmistakably show a familiarity with fauvist work. Derain is especially brought to mind, but he was less well served in the magazines which Shore was likely to have seen¹, and probably in the prints available from Nibbi, than Matisse. Nor was Derain mentioned by Shore in the list of artists with whom he became familiar through Cahiers d'Art and Formes - although Dufy was. In this instance specification of precise individual influences within the fauvist movement cannot be made with confidence.

As in The Circus, the only known earlier work showing a complete figure, Shore has made no attempt to represent the human form in any anatomical detail. The cursory modelling of the participants' bodies and faces is again similar to that used by impressionist artists for distant figures, but blown up in scale; a few brisk strokes of one colour constitute a body which is then topped with a dash of orange for a face and one of another colour for hair or a hat. The larger figures in the foreground have been individually isolated from one another with thick black outlines strongly redolent of Rouault.

1 Although several of Derain's works were reproduced in the periodicals most readily available to Shore during the years preceding the execution of Bolero, nearly all were in black-and-white. The only reproduction in colour found in a search by the author was a nearly monochromatic head study in Colour, Vol 1 (new series), No 8, June 1929, pl4.

Rouault was included in Shore's list of artists in Forty Years Seek and Find. An article on Rouault in Cahiers d'Art (Vol 3, 1928) contains an illustration of his Paysage et Figures in which the outlines and treatment of figures is very close to that of the foreground figures in Ravel's Bolero. Whether Shore had seen this particular issue of Cahiers d'Art is uncertain. Nibbi did not open his bookshop until 1930, but he may have had back numbers of some magazines either for sale or in his own library. In any case, Shore claimed to be familiar with Rouault's work; and faceless, simplified forms outlined sharply in black are so much a part of Rouault's oeuvre from before the first world war right through the twenties that there can be no doubt of his influence on Bolero.

Ravel's Bolero occupies a singular position in Shore's development. It is quite unlike any work preceding or following it in its treatment of figures, and the sense of movement and excitement evoked is rivalled only by The Circus. These two works, together with the now-lost Back Yard Idyll of 1927 represent three peaks in the evolution of Shore's painting. They are separated by two-year periods during which Shore retreated from the beachheads which these key works established in the domain of the conservative Melbourne art establishment. In both periods he was beaten back by a combination of adverse public reception, lack of knowledgeable encouragement from those around him, and wavering self-confidence.

The hostile critical reception Shore's work attracted in 1927 and 1929 will be considered more fully in the final chapter. The encouragement he needed to sustain his enthusiasm and to combat his own self-doubt - not in his art but in himself - would not have been provided by his closest associates. Frater's bluster and self-assurance would not conceal from the sensitive Shore his basically superficial understanding of twentieth century artistic developments. The lack of support for Shore from his friends was exemplified in the withdrawal of Frater, the ageing Isabel Tweddle, and the eccentric Brandt from the proposed 1929 joint exhibition.

By 1931, and Bolero, circumstances should have been more propitious for Shore to build on this success. Critical opinion had begun to swing towards a more tolerant approach to the modernists. Shore was seeing less of Frater and spending considerable time with Nibbi and Burdett, two of the most sympathetic and knowledgeable men in the country.

But this moral support was offset by the financial situation - of the economy in general and of Shore in particular. He sought to resolve his immediate financial problems and the uncertainty of his future by his approach to Bell. One of the earliest results of their alliance was the nude study which Bell asked Shore to paint just prior to the opening of the school.

Shore's eclecticism during the early thirties has been demonstrated by the works so far considered, and is further exemplified in Bella Donna (Pl 74). Shore acknowledged the influence of Modigliani on this nude (see p 166); it is evident in the angularity, elongation and simplified modelling of the figure. By choosing a rear view, the artist has dispensed with the need to delineate facial features and model the breasts. Even so, the contours of the face which would have been seen from this angle have been compressed into a single graceful curve.

By arranging the model's right arm to be central and to the foreground of the picture, with the fingers extending to the lower edge of the canvas, Shore emphasizes its length without distorting it. The girl's weight is thrown onto her left arm, allowing the right to descend in a smooth arc from the shoulder.

Modelling has been minimised, and shadows all but eliminated. The convincing sense of three-dimensionality is achieved largely through the use of line of varying thickness in a manner owing a debt to Matisse. The single line which forms both the right thigh and the muscle of the calf is particularly felicitous. Where tone is used for modelling, as in the right arm and lower leg, the result is less satisfactory, and the hands lack the grace of the rest of the figure. As a first attempt at painting from the model, however, and one executed under the stress of having to impress Bell, Bella Donna is a highly successful exercise, and it is understandable that Bell displayed it proudly to his students.

By comparison, the Nude in the Australian National Gallery collection (Pl 73) is a more vigorous study, lacking the unity of Bella Donna. The lack of finish in this work, and its size (only 16 cm. high), suggest that it may have been dashed off to make a point to a group of students. Most of Shore's nudes must have been no more significant, to judge by the token prices paid for those mentioned in the sales book and the prices asked for the exhibited nudes.

There was, however, at least one major nude apart from Bella Donna; the 1932 Contemporary Group (Melbourne)¹ catalogue lists Belladonna [sic] and another nude, both priced at thirty guineas, twice the price of Shore's next most expensive offering.² Thirty guineas was also asked for a Nude Study in the Contemporary Group (Sydney) exhibition of 1934.

Two drawings of female nudes survive, and as they date from 1934 and 1935, they can be taken to demonstrate Shore's improved drawing under Bell's guidance. Their very survival points to Shore's high opinion of them,

- 1 In the catalogue of this (its first) exhibition, the group called itself the Contemporary Art Group; in later catalogues this was shortened to the Contemporary Group, by which title it will be referred to here, with (Melbourne) appended to distinguish it from Sydney's Contemporary Group.
- 2 It is just possible that this Belladonna is not the nude painted at Bell's request. Shore's sales book lists a sketch of Belladonna Lilies sold to Harry Mitchell for one guinea, and Shore may have executed a major work of the same subject. Thirty guineas is, however, more than Shore placed on any other flowerpiece before 1938.

but we have further evidence that he was particularly satisfied with both of them.

The earlier drawing, in brown chalk, is now in the National Gallery of Victoria¹, and was the first Shore to enter that collection, if somewhat deviously. W.B.McInnes, acting director of the NGV at the time, saw the drawing in the 1934 Contemporary Group (Melbourne) exhibition and recommended its purchase to the Trustees. Daryl Lindsay also wanted to buy the drawing for his own collection, but deferred to the Gallery. He was annoyed when the Trustees delayed their decision and eventually rejected the work. Lindsay bought it and a short time later presented the Gallery with a two-part gift - an antique vase and the Shore drawing - ensuring its acceptance. (AMSA, p137)

This drawing was one of several shown by Shore in the 1934 Contemporary Group exhibition.² In it he achieves an admirable solidity, especially in the abdomen, as much through his use of line as with some delicate shading. The other surviving drawing, a pencil sketch (Pl 75), is of a more even quality than the earlier chalk drawing. It has been inscribed on the reverse by its present owner,

- 1 It is illustrated in Whitelaw, B., Australian Drawings of the Thirties and Forties, NGV, p37.
- 2 AMSA, p135, although the year is not given here. The drawings must have been additional exhibits as they do not appear in the catalogue of any of the Group's exhibitions. The drawing now in the NGV is included in Shore's sales book under 1933, but this must be an error, as McInnes became acting director in February 1934, Cox, L.B., The National Gallery of Victoria 1861-1968, NGV, Melbourne, 1970, p132.

Justin Gill; "Arnold was very satisfied with this drawing - one of his best in his opinion."

Despite Shore's increased satisfaction with his drawing, and the opportunities now available for him to draw and paint from the school's models, the human figure remained a subject which he attempted only rarely in his paintings. Portraiture aside, only two of the identifiable paintings from his years at the school feature figures. Other figure studies were exhibited but are now lost.¹ In these two known works (Plates 76, 77) the human form is treated in a detailed manner markedly different from that used in The Circus and Ravel's Bolero (Plates 37, 72), the only two pre-Bourke Street works containing figures.

In the earlier paintings, figures were modelled summarily with a few brisk strokes. In The Class at Work (Pl 76) of 1932, Shore has portrayed the female students, sitting primly in their straight-backed chairs, in sufficient detail to recognize them as individuals. The broad black outlines of Ravel's Bolero have been fined down to delineate arms and legs, the bodies are firmly modelled, and although most of the women are seen from behind, the girl on the extreme right is shown in profile with distinguishable eye, nose and mouth carefully picked out.

1 In his review of the 1933 Contemporary Group exhibition, George Bell wrote of Shore's "two familiar scenes in Melbourne streets; the city ratcatchers going to work and cricket enthusiasts listening to a wireless report." (Sun, August 3, 1933). These were presumably the exhibits entitled 'City' and 'Bodyline' respectively.

Shore painted this picture from a photograph¹, so that the problem of representing three-dimensional figures and space on a two-dimensional surface had been partially solved for him by the camera. The painting is itself known only from a photograph.² Its most significant feature is its historical interest, showing as it does one aspect of the studio's layout, and Cézanne's Boy in a Red Waistcoat among other reproductions on the wall.

The least successful of Shore's figure paintings is the uncharacteristic The Invitation (Pl 77). This is one of only two known examples of Shore's work with a religious theme.³ In 1939 it was given to the guild of the Church of England, Mt. Macedon, but it was not painted specifically for the church. Shore made his first visit to Macedon in 1937, and The Invitation, though now dated 1936, was shown with the Contemporary Group in Melbourne in 1934, and illustrated in Manuscripts in November of that year.⁴

- 1 A note in Shore's scrapbook accompanying a photograph of the painting gives this information, together with the names of the students portrayed (see Catalogue entry, No. 147). This is one of only two works which Shore is known to have painted from a photograph; the other was a portrait of Sir William Cresswell, painted in 1935 (sales book for 1936).
- 2 Apart from a copy of the photograph in Shore's scrapbook, the painting was also reproduced in Art in Australia, Series 3, No 53, December 1933.
- 3 Excluding his student work. The other is Emmaeus, present whereabouts unknown, shown in the 1929 one-man exhibition. In the sales book for 1939, The Invitation is subtitled 'Emmaeus', but Blamire Young's description of the 1929 exhibit (mentioning table accessories and a female head, Herald, August 12, 1929) precludes the possibility of the two works' being the same.
- 4 Manuscripts, No 11, November 25, 1934, p45.

If The Class at Work is stilted by comparison with Bolero and The Circus, the figures in The Invitation appear positively atrophied. In concentrating on fine detail in the faces and hands, Shore has sacrificed the freedom and vitality of his earlier studies. He recognized that he had lost some of his exuberance under Bell's influence:

I did my best to gain understanding of his thought, so that I could weld his logic to my ideas, and muster all for the enlivenment of his painting. In the effort I lost much of the freedom of spirit I'd enjoyed prior to starting the school. (AMSA, pl21)

Nowhere is this more evident than in The Invitation.

The style is surprising from an artist purportedly teaching modern art. There are simplifications in the forms of the trees and building, but they are more redolent of Italian primitives than of twentieth century developments when viewed in conjunction with the stilted poses of the three men, their laboured solidity, and the compositional perspective whereby objects exist on a series of planes parallel to the picture surface rather than in a continuous space.

Shore was never comfortable with the human figure. Figure studies exposed weaknesses in his draughtsmanship more ruthlessly than did flowerpieces or landscapes, and he seems to have abandoned the genre entirely from the time of his departure from the school. That he attempted even as many nudes as he did while with Bell is probably attributable more to circumstances than to his own choice of subject.

Portraits

Portraits were a different matter, but only in so far as they provided a direct source of income, and a means of furthering his reputation. In his commissioned portraits, Shore adopted a conservative approach, producing works which lack the characteristic vigour of the flowerpieces. His tentativeness suggests a reluctance to offend, almost an awe of, his sitters, several of whom were titled or highly placed in Melbourne society.¹

Shore's first commissioned portrait, of Mr Justice Evatt (Pl 78), is a striking one, not least because of the almost garish colours of the robes. Shore's greatest problem, as he later wrote,

belonged to the colour harmony. I had to endeavour to harmonise the rich vermillion [sic] and cerise of the robes with the bluish purple bloom of the tweed suit he was wearing, the background and the other elements of the picture. (AMSA, pl46)

Notwithstanding the clashing colours, the portrait is quite conventional. The modelling of the face reflects the influence of no European artist more advanced than Sickert, and is considerably less adventurous than Frater's portraits of the same period.

Dr Evatt had earlier purchased one of Shore's flowerpieces.²

- 1 In his description of his portrait of Justice Evatt Shore wrote: "I drew the picture carefully, with brushes, and was cautious as I delineated his features." (AMSA, pl45)
- 2 According to AMSA (p 146), the flower study was bought "during the year" (1935); Shore's sales book, however, records a flowerpiece of "Cannas etc." sold to Evatt in 1934. The precision and apparent contemporaneity of the sales book suggests that its information is the more reliable.

In view of his public championship of modern art¹, he may well have expected from Shore a portrait displaying more of the bravura approach of the artist's contemporary flower studies.

Shore painted at least two portraits of Lady Barrett during his years at the school. The sitter is of more interest than the works themselves, neither of which gives any indication of the closeness of the relationship which developed between the two.

One of these portraits (Pl 81) was entered for the 1934 Archibald Prize; even by the standards of the Archibald entries of the thirties this appears, from the newspaper photograph by which alone it is known, to be an uninspired and conventional portrait of a plain, elderly lady. In the other portrait (Pl 80), Shore seems to have made a conscious attempt to stress Lady Barrett's age and lack of personal appeal by painting her huddled in black with a veil shading eyes which are turned away in profile from the viewer.

Shore accepted two more portrait commissions while at the Bourke Street school.² Although the portraits were painted at the homes of the sitters in Shore's free time,

- 1 Particularly over the issue of the Australian Academy of Art where he took the role of principal spokesman against the Academy and his political opponent, R.G.Menzies.
- 2 AMSA, p157. Shore's sales book, read in conjunction with AMSB, suggests that the three portrait commissions mentioned here must be Lady Baldwin Spencer (Pl 79) of 1935, Lady Cresswell of 1936 and a portrait of a friend of Mrs Lemann's. The sales book records Shore's fifth commission as being a portrait of Mrs Russell Grimwade which was not completed until 1937. In the summary at the beginning of his scrapbook, Shore omits the portrait of Mrs Lemann's friend, and lists the Grimwade portrait as his fourth commission. Shore does not include the portraits of his friend Lady Barrett among his commissioned works.

his acceptance of the commissions was criticized by Bell, who labelled portraiture "a bastard art." (AMSA, p157) Presumably it was the commissioning which 'bastardized' portraiture, as Bell himself painted many portraits. Indeed a joint exercise in portraiture produced the twin portraits of a chef: Bell's The Chef and Shore's Melbourne's Oldest Chef (Plates 82 and 83 respectively).

The two works are not portraits in the normal sense of the word, in that both artists are more concerned with the mountainous white forms of the body than in portraying the character of the sitter. The dating of Chef poses an interesting problem. It is clearly dated '34'; the reproduction in Eagle and Minchin, op. cit., p 55, shows the date, which is obscured by the frame in Plate 83. However, a work of Shore's entitled Melbourne's Oldest Chef was offered for sale at thirty guineas in the Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibition of September 1933. Either the work is now wrongly dated, or Shore painted two major versions of the subject.

No reference can be found to a second version. Although Shore discussed The Chef on several occasions with his wife in later years, at no time did he mention that he painted the subject twice. Joan Yonge, who joined the school in 1934, remembers the old man who posed for the students in his

chef's hat worn with an ordinary suit. She concludes that "evidently Arnold and George got him to put on his white coat."¹ This does not necessarily support a date of 1934. The 'chef' may have posed, in full regalia, for Shore and Bell in mid-1933, and been asked back to model for the students the following year. Their earlier experience with the white coat may have suggested to Shore and Bell that the chef pose for the students in a less demanding suit.

Further to this, Bell exhibited a work entitled 'The Chef' in the (Melbourne) Contemporary Group exhibition held in August 1933. And finally, Arthur Streaton's comment on the Chef exhibited by Shore in 1933 - that he "looks rather as if he were drying after a dive into the pastry"² - sufficiently aptly describes the extant work to suggest that the two are the same.

It must be concluded that Shore dated the work retrospectively and inaccurately. The date of 1934 given by Eagle and Minchin to Bell's Chef is presumably based on the date on Shore's work, and on Joan Yonge's evidence. Bell's version is dated, but the inscription is unclear. June Helmer, in her catalogue to the George Bell exhibition held at the University of Melbourne Gallery in 1979, describes the inscription as "George Bell 3?" and gives the date as c1933. Arguments concerning the date aside, the twin portraits provide an interesting comparison of the two artists' styles after they had been working together for at least a year.

1 Quoted in Eagle and Minchin, op.cit., p54.

2 Argus, September 12, 1933, p8.

Mary Eagle believes that these paintings represent the point at which the styles of Shore and Bell most closely approach each other.¹ If their styles did draw together, it could be expected that they would have done so at this time, when the artists had been working together for at least a year. That subject and pose are so similar, differing only in the angle of vision, tends to obscure marked differences in style. This similarity of format may well have spurred Shore to sustain, to a greater extent than ever before, that aspect of his painting which most clearly distinguishes it from Bell's - his palpable enjoyment of the tactility of rich paint.

Bell's surfaces are smoother and dryer, approaching the chalky quality of Frater's work. Throughout this period, Bell's portraits in particular are closer to Frater's than to Shore's, having in common this surface texture and an associated simplified modelling of the facial planes. Even today, some fifty years after its execution, certain sections of Shore's Chef, applied with overloaded brush and knife, give the impression of being not quite dry.

An interesting comparison can be made with another portrait of a chef with which Shore was certainly familiar. William Orpen's Chef de l'Hotel Chatham (Pl 84) was reproduced in Orpen's Outline of Art, the series to

1 Eagle and Minchin, op. cit., pp54-5.

which Shore and Frater subscribed in the twenties, and which so strongly affected them.¹ In this work, Orpen poses his subject so that the arms stand out in sharp contrast against the dark background. The folds thus introduced into the sleeves, the scarf, the belt, the double row of buttons and the foreground accoutrements all supply contrasting details which the paintings by Bell and Shore lack.

If Shore's use of ridged impasto is excessive, it can be seen as an attempt to inject some variation into a subject which suffers from too broad an expanse of featureless white. It can also be seen as a conscious attempt on Shore's part to ensure that his painting and Bell's of the same subject are radically different. His opinion of Bell's modernity did not change while they worked together, and he would not have wanted to risk producing a work which too closely resembled his partner's.

From 1933 Shore increasingly introduced thick dabs of pure pigment into some of his flowerpieces, particularly in the foliage, to produce a glistening effect, but in only one other work of the period is this impasto technique maintained throughout the surface of the canvas to the extent of Melbourne's Oldest Chef. This is a small undated sketch showing two large pieces of material hung on a washing line against a background

1 This reproduction appeared in the final issue of the series, 'Art of Today'.

of inner suburban buildings and sheds (Pl 85).¹
 It is signed simply 'S', but this by no means indicates
 in itself an unimportant work. The single 'S' as a
 signature is used in only two other known paintings -
 but they are the major works Back Yard Idyll and
Ravel's Bolero.

This sketch is probably the painting exhibited in the
 Twenty Melbourne Painters 1933 exhibition with the title
 'Special Washing'.² Blamire Young specifically mentioned
Special Washing, referring to it as a sketch, in his
 review of that exhibition. It and Melbourne's Oldest
 Chef were

hung one above the other . . . giving . . . the
 opportunity of realising the fine sensitiveness of the
 artist's colour. It is most impressive. So far the
 actual texture of the paint lags behind the quality
 of the colour. This may be from the free use that
 the artist makes of his palette knife.³

The reference to the texture of the paint does not
 distinguish between the two paintings, so it can be
 inferred that the texture was similar in each case.

2 The present owner, Harry den Hartog, swapped one of
 his own still lifes with Shore, receiving this work
 in return. He believes that the swap took place
 "a few years before Bell went overseas," but in view
 of his uncertainty, this need not be inconsistent
 with a date soon after the exhibition in September 1933.
 The price of Special Washing - ten guineas compared
 with thirty guineas for Chef - indicates a small
 painting.

3 Herald, September 11, 1933, p4.

1 The painting is considered at this point because of
 its stylistic affinities with Melbourne's Oldest Chef.

The application of paint was certainly quite different from anything else which had been shown in Melbourne, or elsewhere in Australia, to that time. Young's reservations concerning it are understandable, particularly in the light of the critic's own delicate brushwork.

Special Washing (assuming it to be the painting in Plate 85) is Shore's closest extant pre-war approach to an abstract work. It is only with some difficulty that the forms identify themselves. The setting is almost certainly Shore's own backyard, viewed from the end opposite that in Back Yard Idyll (Pl 32). The gnarled tree on the right in the earlier work appears again on the left in Special Washing, and the clothesline supporting the parrot's cage also plays a central part in the later sketch.

Unfortunately the surface of Special Washing has grown discoloured, so that we get little more indication of the original colours than we know of those in Back Yard Idyll. It is clear from some of the remaining colour juxtapositions, however, that Shore has not felt constrained to follow the guidelines he and Bell suggested to their students.¹

The apparent abandonment with which the pigment has been swept onto the canvas goes, in its freedom, well

1 Some of these suggestions, based on a colour wheel, are outlined in the lengthy extract from AMSA reprinted in Eagle and Minchin, op. cit., pp35-7.

beyond the post-impressionists. In this sense, the European artist of whose work special washing is most reminiscent is Soutine.

Shore could surely not have seen an original Soutine at this time, but his name is on the list of artists with whom Shore claimed to have become familiar through magazine reproductions in the early thirties (see p 191), and Nibbi may have imported some Soutine prints. Shore was incapable of Soutine's extreme spatial and anatomical distortions, but the brilliant colours as well as the vigour of a work such as Woman in Red (Pl 87) would have appealed to Shore, and can be seen as an influence on some of the flowerpieces of the next few years.

Shore's career as a portrait painter was brief. His last recorded commission was for a head and bust of Mrs David Hunter, completed in 1938.¹ The previous year brought an important commission for a portrait of Mrs Russell Grimwade (Pl 104). Russell Grimwade was a member of the NGV's Felton Bequest Committee, and by cementing friendly relations with him, Shore gained another ally in the art establishment circle at the Gallery.

Grimwade insisted on paying twenty-five guineas more for the portrait than Shore's asking price of seventy-five guineas, but he was to outdo that generosity a few months later. He offered to pay all of Shore's expenses for

1 Catalogue no. 287, whereabouts unknown. A note in the sales book reads: "Worked for weeks on this over forty sittings."

a study trip overseas - a trip such as Shore had craved since his break with Meldrum, but which his mother's dependence on him, and his financial position, had denied him.¹ The offer, however, was refused. Shore may well have been reluctant to accept such beneficence on principle, but the reason he gave Grimwade was that he wished first "to see what I could paint of the Australian bush." (AMSB, pl20)

The arrangement of the portrait of Mrs Grimwade was left entirely to Shore. (AMSA, pl88) Its unconventional composition gives the first suggestion of Shore's increasing interest in landscape, but its stiff formality is reminiscent of an earlier era.

Much more successful as a portrait is the slightly earlier Reverie (Pl 105)², the cut-down head from which is now in the National Gallery of Victoria.³ It was painted while Shore's relationship with Grandy Lemann was developing, and conveys a sense of his tender feelings towards her, through the thoughtful and sensitive expression of the face. There is an intimacy to this

1 AMSB, pl19. That Shore does not mention his mother in his reasons for refusing the trip places Grimwade's offer in 1938, after her death.

2 Reproduced in FYSF, where it is entitled 'Reverie': Madame Fanny Bristow'.

3 The section now in the NGV is signed and dated 1936, but this inscription was clearly added when the large original was cut down. The whole work is known only through the black-and-white photograph in FYSF. No date can be discerned in that reproduction, but the date given in FYSF is 1936-7. It is not known when the size of the painting was reduced. Shore wrote in AMSB (pl63): "I have since been sorry I did not preserve the whole work."

work which is approached by no other extant portrait of Shore's.

Further recognition came in 1938 with the award of Ballarat's valuable Crouch Prize for the portrait of himself entitled Four Tens (Pl 107).¹ Shore received the news of the award three weeks after the notification of the Herald prize, and one week after the death of his mother. The portrait is the antithesis of the colouristic virtuosity for which most critics had now begun to praise him. The naturalistic skin tones are repeated in the background, and the clothes are neutral buffs and greys. The portrait's undeniable impact lies in the great strength of character in the face, underlined by the rock-like stability of the composition.

This work makes an interesting comparison with the self-portrait by Frater now in the Australian National Gallery (Pl 108).² In both, the viewer is forced to look up at the artist's face, and is met by a steady, almost supercilious expression. The implicit self-assurance may have been a genuine expression of Frater's image of himself; but it is certain from his writings and from recollections of his acquaintances that Shore at no stage exuded the self-confidence of the man portrayed in Four Tens.

1 At the time Victoria's richest art prize. The title refers to Shore's fortieth birthday in May 1937, at which time the portrait was painted. The judge was Shore's friend from his years at the Gallery school, John Rowell.

2 The self-portrait of Frater is undated, but the printed signature, the style, and the artist's age suggest a date in the early thirties.

Another self-portrait from the following year (1938) shows Shore in far less formal circumstances, dressed in a singlet and smoking a pipe (Pl 109). There is, however, nothing relaxed in the pose or the expression. The artist, it seems, is more concerned with projecting a desired image than with revealing dispassionately his inner being. By contrast, a self-portrait completed in the last year of his life (Pl 110) - the only surviving self-portrait to have been painted later than the two just considered - was described by Patrick McCaughey as "among the most revealing and disturbing documents in the history of Australian painting."¹

No other extant portrait from the late thirties is known², and very few were painted in later years.³ Portraiture held little appeal for him, although the fee for a commissioned work was always welcome.

The self-portraits from 1937 and 1938 (Plates 107, 109) may even have been attempted with a specific view to improving his portrait technique in the hope of attracting

- 1 In the foreword to the catalogue of 'The Later Work of Arnold Shore', Powell Street Gallery, 1977.
- 2 A male portrait of 'Pat' was exhibited with the TMP in 1937. Burdett singled it out for favourable comment, describing it as "a brilliant little study, full of character," and preferring it to the Camellias bought by the National Gallery of Victoria; Herald, September 20, 1937, p11. No further details are known of the sitter or the painting's whereabouts.
- 3 Apart from the 1962 self-portrait (Pl 110) and a few pen-and-ink sketches (Catalogue nos. 658, 659, 758, 761, 762), the only later portraits known are an oil sketch of Alice Hill (see Cat. no. 622) painted in 1947 and the large portrait of Alice Panton (Pl 173).

further commissions. If so, he was to be disappointed; the only commission recorded after his award of the Crouch Prize was the portrait of Mrs David Hunter (see p232 and note 1). The difficulties he experienced with that portrait would have dampened any temporary enthusiasm he may have felt for portraiture.

Portraits, at least within the rather narrow definition of them understood by Shore (and by most of his contemporaries, to judge by the Dobell fiasco) were unsuitable media for the application of the freer, more expressive style which he increasingly adopted as the war approached. He felt constrained to aim principally at a recognizable likeness, and consequently in most of his portraits of the thirties the vigour of his best works is subjugated to a concern for accurate representation of physical features.

Significantly, in his most strikingly original portrait of the thirties, Melbourne's Oldest Chef, he was under no obligation to satisfy the sitter, and, ignoring verisimilitude, he has conveyed a sense of character missing from his later, more painstakingly executed commissions.

*

From midway through his period at the Bourke Street school, Shore's approach to his painting changed significantly. During 1932 and 1933 he continued to experiment with a variety of styles informed by familiarity through reproductions with artists from both sides of the English Channel. The most successful of these works, and the most important in the light of his subsequent development, are those in which pigment is laid thickly and exuberantly onto the canvas in a manner suggestive of Soutine and, to a lesser extent, Van Gogh and Matthew Smith.

The paintings from 1934 and 1935 are more subdued both in colour scheme and paint application. The added responsibilities of running the school single-handedly, and of commenting publicly on the works of others, may well have had an inhibitory effect on Shore's approach to his painting.

There is also, in the works of his later years at the school, a greater consistency, if less spontaneity. Teaching his own artistic theories to others for the first time appears to have consolidated those theories in his painting. Having laid down to his students guidelines based on his own practices, he may have felt an obligation to maintain a consistency of style. Whether or not this was a conscious attitude on his part, it was inimical to experimentation and hence to development.

Shore's writings leave no room for doubting his conscientiousness. He may not have been a particularly gifted teacher, as Bell undoubtedly was, but from the time of Bell's departure for Europe it was Shore's duty to the school and his students which became his first priority.

The immediate effect of his freedom from the school was a tendency to experiment with a variety of styles, some of which were less well suited than others to his artistic strengths. This eclecticism was compounded by uncertainty about his future, and by conflicting loyalties and interests.

His flowerpieces were now being well received, but he was increasingly attracted to landscape. He was awarded prizes for his more subdued works, but instinctively he preferred, and kept returning to, bright colours and rich textures. In his private life he had to reconcile his loyalty to his mother with his unconventional and increasingly close relationship with Grandy Lemann, and the conflicting ideologies of the Contemporary Art Society, the Academy, and his own restricted view of modernism.

It would be conjectural to specify individual European works which Shore may have seen in reproduction during the thirties. In the discussion of his own work, however, it has been shown that he was influenced to differing degrees by several major twentieth century artists, among them Modigliani, Rouault, Matisse, Duncan Grant and Matthew Smith. A familiarity with Vlaminck's work, especially that from his early fauvist years, is also evident in several of Shore's works from this period.

The Banksias illustrated in Plate 100 bears comparison with a 1909 flowerpiece by V. Minck in the Kahnweiler collection (Pl 102). Common elements are the sharply angled triangle of the table jutting up behind the vase, a mixture in the foliage of fully-laden and near-dry brushstrokes which give volume and variety to the forms, and a background enlivened by the juxtaposition of multi-faceted areas of neutral colours. Though painting some thirty years later, Shore was still unable to take Vlaminck's spatial liberties; his vase is more traditionally rounded, and it sits less precariously on a less geometrical tablecloth.

Shore may not have approved of some of Vlaminck's savage distortions of colour, but was almost certainly influenced by his sculptural application of paint. Even in a reproduction, aspects of Vlaminck's aggressive technique are clearly evident. His portrait of Derain (Pl 86), a key work in which ridges of bright colour stand out clearly from the surface, is likely to have been familiar to Shore. The paintwork in Melbourne's Oldest Chef (Pl 83) owes it a direct debt.

There were, however, important artists and movements beyond the scope of Shore's appreciation. Aware of his reputation as head of Melbourne's only purportedly modern school of painting, Shore managed to contain his antipathy to much of the truly advanced European work which reached

Melbourne in reproduction; indeed in commenting on current Melbourne exhibitions there was little danger that it would be exposed. The limits of his appreciation did not begin to show in his reviews until he had been appointed a critic in his own right (not simply as a stand-in for Bell) in the 1950s.

In his autobiographical manuscript, however, Shore could be less circumspect. His 'disgust' at Picasso's 'extravagances' has already been cited. In the same section of AMSA, Shore criticized the Dadaists for their political motivations and dismissed the surrealists as nothing but "revivalists of subject picture painting . . . who . . . sported a Freudian Kink." (AMSA, p178)

On Bell's return, Shore had hoped that his own reduced enthusiasm for "the most extreme modernists," combined with Bell's increased understanding of modernism, would bring the two partners together. Bell claimed to have discerned in Shore's letters a change in attitude (although he did not expand on this); if the letters were written in the vein of these extracts from the autobiography, Bell's concern would be understandable, but not sufficient to explain in full his own antagonistic attitude. It would appear, however, that from the time of his return Bell's attitude, if not his painting, was more adventurous and forward-looking than Shore's; Shore implies as much in both autobiographies.

Some of the alliances which Shore formed during the thirties further indicate his turning away from the challenges of modernism to the comparative comforts of the conservative Melbourne art establishment. Following the NGV's purchase of Camellias, the trustees asked Shore to give a series of lectures which were received sufficiently enthusiastically for the invitation to be repeated annually.¹ Through this association with the Gallery, he and J.S.Macdonald became close friends.

Lionel Lindsay was another of Shore's closest friends. They were introduced by Lionel's brother Daryl at a dinner arranged for that specific purpose, probably in 1934. The immediate liking Shore took to Lionel deepened while the two were both working for the Herald-Sun corporation - Lindsay briefly as art critic for the Herald in 1935, and Shore in Bell's place on the Sun. Lionel Lindsay, seconded by Sydney Ure Smith, opened Shore's 1937 one-man show in Sydney, and when Shore first reached Sydney some years later, Lindsay was "the one artist I just had to see." (AMSA, p181) It was Lindsay's conversation and hospitality which Shore appreciated, rather than his painting, of which Shore makes no mention in his writings.

Lindsay's present-day reputation as a reactionary rests largely on his Addled Art, published in 1942. His reviews for the Herald during 1935 display evidence of a more open-minded tolerance, but he was not really enthusiastic about any twentieth century artistic movement. His

1 "Each successive year up to the present," according to AMSA (p185), written during the forties.

complimentary reviews of Shore's work in the Twenty Melbourne Painters and Group 12 exhibitions of 1935 confirm its increasing conservatism.

Other critics and the public were beginning to warm to Shore's modified modernism. Two flowerpieces of his were reproduced in separate issues of Art in Australia during 1938.¹ His total sales less commission for 1937 amounted to £312.17.0, and this increased in 1938, the last full year he spent in Melbourne before going to Macedon, to £569.7.0, which compares favourably with the national basic wage of £203 in 1938.² This money, together with £300 from the sale of the family home, willed to him on his mother's death in March 1938, gave him the financial security to move to Macedon, where income from picture sales alone could not be relied on for support.

Melbourne was on the threshold of an artistic revolution in which Shore was to take no direct part. He had not, indeed, contributed significantly to the advancement of modernism since his earliest years at the Bourke Street school. As the cause of contemporary art began to gain some real momentum, Shore chose to dissociate himself from its most influential and outspoken advocates by joining the Australian Academy in preference to the Contemporary Art Society, and leaving the city.

1 3:71, May 1938, p34; and 3:73, November 1938, p49. The second of these is illustrated in Plate 112.

2 The basic wage for the Six Capital Cities was 78 shillings per week in December 1938; Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia, 1938, p572. The details of Shore's sales are taken from his sales book.

Several uncertainties had crept into Shore's work during the thirties; adversely affecting its development. The earliest was the uncertainty of his own future following the decline in the stained-glass trade. In settling this he adopted the potentially conflicting roles of the teacher and the innovator. This conflict was in turn replaced, on his departure from the school, by a renewed uncertainty about his future career.

He began to see associates espousing modern movements he had previously scorned, and must have wondered whether his original judgements on these movements were sound. Attracting some public success, he had to choose between satisfying what he saw as the expectations of that public, and pursuing new lines of development. Finally he had to choose between two ideologies - those of the C.A.S. and the Academy - neither of which had his wholehearted support.

Shore's fragile self-confidence was inadequate for the satisfactory resolution of these conflicts and uncertainties. His move to Macedon can be seen as an attempt to escape the necessity to resolve them. Retreat, however, need not be a sign of weakness; certainly the move enabled him to develop those aspects of his painting wherein lay its greatest strengths.

CHAPTER SIX

THE SWING TO LANDSCAPE

Since the turn of the century, the painting of landscape in Australia, with few exceptions, had degenerated into the application of a small number of set formulae. Close parallels can be drawn between the landscape painting of Australia, Europe and America during the nineteenth century. Von Guerard, Piquenit, Forrest and Chevalier, like Thomas Cole and Frederic March in America, concentrated on the grandeur of the Australian landscape in a tradition stemming from Caspar David Friedrich. Man was depicted as an insignificant intruder, introduced into compositions to emphasize the extent and magnificence of his surroundings.

As the Barbizon painters adopted a softer, more benevolent view of the landscape, so, somewhat later, did George Innes, Thomas Whittredge and Ralph Blakelock in America, and Louis Buvelot in Australia. Buvelot's landscapes are welcoming and intimate; though rarely peopled, they are implicitly never far from civilization. Human figures attained a more important role in the work of Julian Ashton and the Heidelberg painters. The majority of landscapes painted in Australia around the turn of the century were concerned with man's relationship with his environment. Streeton produced more 'pure landscapes' than his contemporaries, but most of these follow Buvelot's example in suggesting scenes from which men are only temporarily absent.

This tradition continued into the twentieth century. Elioth Gr uner's sleepy farmlets, Penleigh Boyd's views of the Yarra and James R. Jackson's of Sydney Harbour,

and W.B.McInnes' studies of farm life all maintained a steady popularity, mildly romanticizing aspects of the country with which city-dwellers were familiar.

Even Streeton's sweeping valley vistas and Heysen's gum-tree strewn hills, though far from the city, have about them a sense of placid acceptance of man's presence. These rolling acres could readily be farmed; drovers could ride and camp in safety among these trees.

Many of the landscapes chosen for mass reproduction, and consequently displayed in countless schoolrooms and suburban homes, depicted slices of a countryside treed with elms and poplars, no more Australian than English. Harold Herbert, Carlyle Jackson, Robert Johnson and William Lister Lister, among many others, satisfied the public demand for untroubled, picturesque vistas. The keynote was serenity; landscapes were intended to be soothing, not stimulating.

This was especially so in Melbourne. The dashing landscapes of Wakelin, Cossington-Smith and Margaret Preston received limited exposure in the southern capital. In Rupert Bunny's Australian works, the landscape was usually subsidiary to the figures occupying it, and was rarely recognizably Australian. The young artists who began to experiment with modern European styles under George Bell showed little interest in pure landscape, preferring figure studies and still lifes. The landscape tradition in Melbourne prior to the second world war remained enshrined in the citadel established by Heysen and Streeton and tended by a host of minor followers.

Under the terms of that tradition, Australian landscape had lost the vigour which infused it during the last years of the nineteenth century. Shore was to revitalize it, exposing aspects of the bush which no artist before him had examined.

The Australian artist most admired by Shore was Tom Roberts.¹ While resemblances between their work are not striking, Shore acknowledged the debt owed Roberts by all Australian artists who came after him. He shared with Roberts the ability to see the Australian landscape through unprejudiced eyes, to respond to its distinctive character and beauty, and to portray it honestly and without embellishment.

The reputation which Shore had established by the time he left the Bourke Street school was based almost exclusively on flower studies. Several key works - notably Back Yard Idyll, The Circus, Bolero, Bella Donna and Chef - were of other subjects, but these were not the paintings which had attracted most favourable comment. Flowerpieces constituted the majority of his output, and almost all his sales, before 1938.

He had shown little interest in the bush landscapes which were to fill so many of his canvases during the later part of his life. There had been a few cityscapes

1 Shore was later to write a brief biography of Roberts, Shore, A., Tom Roberts (Great Australians series), OUP, Sydney, 1964.

(Plates 42 and 94, and note 1, p221), but almost no rural landscapes. Even when he worked away from the city Shore had concentrated less on natural than on man-made elements (Plates 43 and 65).

His lack of interest in landscape at this time is only partly attributable to limited opportunities to paint it. For much of his time at the Bourke Street school Shore had no car, and it can be inferred from the manuscripts that his mother's health was then too delicate to countenance trips out of Melbourne by public transport. In the late twenties and early thirties, however, Shore regularly spent holidays and weekends in the country.

His mother's expectations of constant companionship on these holidays would have restricted his painting opportunities, but had he been determined to paint the landscape he could surely have done so with his mother in attendance, if only from the vantage point of their holiday home.

Furthermore, when his finances were low in the early thirties, Shore acquired the habit of driving to Warrandyte, with only his dog as companion, to fill the car with firewood. (AMSA, p110) These trips would have provided ample opportunity for painting the landscape, but no mention is made of painting at this point in the manuscript, and no landscape sketches from the period have come to light.

The only conventional landscape to have survived from the early thirties is Maldon (Pl 111) of 1933. By selecting an elevated position commanding a view of land sloping away into a river valley, then rising to a distant prominence, Shore has followed one of the stereotyped images of the Australian landscape promulgated particularly by Arthur Streeton and Elioth Grüner. Shore, however, has attempted to graft onto this image Cézanne's method of conveying receding, distant forms. Small faceted brushstrokes are laid against one another, but in a tentative manner not consistently carried through. The result is less than successful, with the distant peak hovering ambiguously above the trees in the middle distance.

Recognition of his lack of perspectival command may have deterred Shore from further attempts at such sweeping vistas. The titles of his exhibited works from the early thirties include only one - Sunbury, exhibited with Twenty Melbourne Painters in 1933 - suggestive of a rural landscape.

One of the first paintings Shore completed after leaving the Bourke Street school was a view from the window of his new South Yarra studio. Darling Street, South Yarra (Pl 94), dated 1936, is painted in quite a new style - one with which he was to experiment only fleetingly. Modelling is minimised, and the broadest areas of colour are subdued, dulled by white to produce an effect reminiscent of Frater's work of that period.

But pure, bright colours - greens and purples - have been abstemiously applied in licks and dashes along the street's length to imbue the scene with a suppressed vigour by comparison with which Frater's later street scenes look chillingly comfortless.

In this painting Shore makes his closest approach to the stream of Melbourne modernism which derived from Bell's teaching. Over the next few years he returned to the smooth, matt surface of Darling Street on several occasions - examples are Jamieson River and Valley (Pl 114) and two versions of Dahlias (see p) - but these were exceptions among a large output of more richly textural paintings.

Shore's confidence was dented by his virtual dismissal from the school and he must have questioned his own artistic directions during the ensuing period, especially following the establishment, and immediate impact, of the Contemporary Art Society. His retirement to Macedon was in part an escape from the conflicting stylistic pressures exerted by his C.A.S. contemporaries. He could not relate to the theories they expounded or the work they produced, although he approved of their progressive attitude.

Since his departure from the school, Shore's freedom from the day-to-day commitments of teaching gave him the opportunity to escape the city more often, but he was restricted by no longer owning a car. Of the landscapes exhibited or sold in 1937 and 1938, few have titles indicating where they were painted, but apart from the Macedon and Jamieson pictures, those few are all of areas

close to Melbourne. Locations specifically mentioned are Warrandyte, Bayswater and Tecoma (1937) and Lysterfield and Croydon (1938) - now all outer suburbs of Melbourne.

Of these pictures, only Landscape, Warrandyte (Pl 115) has been traced. This painting, dated 1937, was sold to Mrs Aarons of Warrandyte in 1938 for fifteen guineas.¹ A work with the same title was shown with the Contemporary Group in Sydney in 1937 but, as it was unsold at ten guineas, is unlikely to be the painting sold privately for fifteen guineas the following year. It is probable that Shore made several trips to Warrandyte during this period; his friends Adrian Lawlor, Clara Southern and Jo Sweatman lived there, and he could have travelled up with Frater, Lina Bryans and Alan Sumner at weekends.²

In the extant Landscape, Warrandyte, paint is applied thickly and freely. The palette knife has been used extensively in the background trees and the sky, and the whole displays the spontaneity and vigour of the better flowerpieces of the thirties. This is the earliest surviving landscape in which Shore's distinctive later style clearly emerges. The application of paint in blocks of integrated greens in the foreground derives directly from Cézanne, but the foliage of the larger trees is rendered in a manner which is distinctively Shore's.

- 1 Sales book for 1938. From Mrs Aarons it passed to the present owner, by which this work can be equated with the sales book entry.
- 2 Sumner has recounted that he often drove Frater and Lina Bryans to Warrandyte for weekend painting trips with Lawlor, and that Shore occasionally accompanied them; interview with Alan Sumner, July 19, 1980.

This highly individualistic treatment draws on a variety of sources - Van Gogh's generous application of paint, the more sculptural technique of fauvist Vlaminck, the massing together of small patches of complementary and contrasting colours instigated by the French neo-impressionists and adapted by several English artists in the years before the first world war - but it is recognizably different from any of them in its sharply edged ridges and tapering licks of paint and in the acutely angled planes with which forms are built up.

As with his earlier flowerpieces, the landscapes of the late thirties display more similarities with English painting than with French. The closest comparisons can perhaps be found with the landscapes of Spencer Gore and Harold Gilman from the years just prior to the first world war. But even here the similarities are not striking; they consist in a common interest in, and blending of, a number of French influences ranging through impressionism, neo-impressionism and fauvism. Shore's sources are more difficult to disentangle as they also include a passing familiarity with a further twenty years of European development. It would be difficult, for instance, to argue for a strong expressionistic streak in Shore's work, but there are occasional suggestions, particularly in the vigorous brushwork and texture of the paint, of the work of Kokoschka and Schmidt-Rottluff.

Stylistic connections with earlier Australian artists are also tenuous. From the time of his awakening to the possibilities of post-impressionism in the twenties, Shore had had little admiration for contemporary Australian artists, most of whom he saw as irrevocably tied to a landscape

tradition which had stagnated since its promising beginnings in the nineteenth century.

Roland Wakelin's work, had it been brought to Shore's attention in the early twenties, would have interested him greatly, but by the thirties Wakelin had diverted his modernism into a drier, more planar style at a time when Shore was moving towards richer, more textural surfaces. Wakelin's work also drew on a variety of sources, but those sources are more readily discernible in individual paintings; some are clearly informed by Kandinsky's brightly coloured Murnau landscapes, while others are very close in style to the modified neo-impressionism of the Englishmen Spencer Gore and Malcolm Drummond.¹ Shore was always concerned to avoid following too closely the style of any one other artist, however much he may have admired his work.

Some similarities can be found between Shore's work and that of Emanuel Phillips Fox. In The Desert Market² Fox has achieved the effect of dazzlingly reflected sunlight with thick patches of pale pigment remarkably similar to those in Shore's landscapes from the late thirties and beyond. Studying in Paris under the American Alexander Harrison, Fox was in touch with pre-war Parisian developments, if not

1 Examples are, respectively, Synchromy in Orange Major of 1919 and The Fruit Seller at Farm Cove of 1915, both illustrated in Lynn, E., The Australian Landscape and its Artists, Bay Books, Sydney, 1977, pp100 & 99. The Fruit Seller displays striking similarities with Drummond's In the Park of c1912, illustrated in Watney, S., English Post-Impressionism, Studio Vista, London, 1980, Plate 21.

2 Howard Hinton collection, Armadale, illustrated in McCulloch, A., The Golden Age of Australian Painting, Lansdowne, Melbourne, 1969, Plate 68. The painting is not dated, but was probably painted in 1912 during Fox's travels in Algeria.

profoundly influenced by them. In his Australian landscapes, however, he followed more closely the Heidelberg tradition in which contrasts of colour and paint texture are subordinate to a unification of the image presented. As he died in 1915, and his work was less well represented in the National Gallery of Victoria than in the Art Gallery of New South Wales, it is difficult to cite Fox as a direct influence on Shore.

Ethel Carrick, Fox's wife, is a more likely influence. She had studied at the Slade School, and spent most of her life in Europe, but settled in Australia in 1933. The luminous quality of her small sketches springs from her generous application of bright pigment in broad, ridged brushstrokes. Shore had used a similar approach in flower studies before 1933, but Carrick Fox demonstrated, before Shore's interest in landscape developed, that it could be applied as effectively to landscape as to still life.

Rupert Bunny was in a position to influence Shore more directly, in that the two were close friends at least from the time of Bunny's return to Melbourne in 1933. Many of his French landscapes were constructed in a Cézannesque, building-block style, and he combined both post-impressionist and fauvist influences in his more vivid mythological studies. There is, however, a serene other-worldliness to most of his work which has little in common with the truth-to-nature approach which marks Shore's landscapes.

Despite Shore's avowed modernism, in his landscapes of the late thirties there is more of French impressionism than of any single later movement. This is particularly evident in The Garden, Wattle Lodge (Pl 116), dated 1937. The trunk of the tree is painted with surprising fidelity of detail.

There is greater freedom in the background trees where the foliage shows the influence of Cézanne tentatively applied, but the vibrating colour of the flower beds to left and right of the path draws directly on the impressionists.¹

Shore's choice of subject matter here begins to approach the 'pure landscapes' of untrammelled bush which were later to constitute such a large proportion of his output. The colours, too, are purer, less adulterated by white than in Landscape, Warrandyte or Darling Street, although the different greens blend together, eliminating sharp colour contrasts.

This is a painting which could be expected to appeal to a broad spectrum of viewers from traditionalists through to moderate progressives. When it is compared with work by Drysdale, Purves-Smith or Thake from the same period, or even with Shore's own work from the late twenties and early thirties, it demonstrates the extent to which he had slipped from the forefront of Melbourne modernism.

* * * * *

1 Wattle Lodge was the home of the Stormonts, who were to remain close friends of Shore's through his Macedon period and afterwards. It would appear that Shore painted at least two views of the garden during the late thirties. 'The Garden, Wattle Lodge' was offered for 15 guineas at the Sydney Contemporary Group exhibition in 1937 (July), and 'Wattle Lodge Garden' for 30 guineas at the 1938 one-man show in Melbourne. The difference in prices and titles indicates two separate works, although it is not clear which of these exhibits is the work illustrated in Plate 116. Although the title favours the Sydney exhibit, the price seems low for a work of this size and quality. More conclusively, Shore wrote "given to nephew" against 'Wattle Lodge Garden' in his copy of the Melbourne catalogue, and the current owner of the extant work is the daughter of one of Shore's nephews.

The period between Shore's departure from the school and his move to Macedon was one of personal and artistic upheaval. Most of the paintings produced lack the conviction of either his earlier or later work. Their timid eclecticism, drawing as much on nineteenth as on twentieth century styles, betrays an uncertainty of direction which was compounded by a measure of public acclaim. Shore was known to the public as a 'modernist'. The less adventurous works he painted at this time were more readily appreciated by members of a public vaguely aware of an obligation to come to terms with modern art. In Shore's toned-down modernism they could reconcile the conflicting demands of taste and aspiration.

The one important development in Shore's art of this period was his growing interest in landscape as subject matter. This interest, sparked by his first visit to Macedon in the spring of 1937¹, was allowed full rein during his three-week holiday there the following year.² The paintings produced then stocked much of the one-man exhibition he mounted at the Athenaeum Gallery in August 1938.

The exhibition was opened by Dr James Darling, headmaster of Geelong Grammar School, and the paintings were arranged on the walls of the Gallery by Basil Burdett. Before the show was officially opened, seven works had been sold, ensuring a financial success. By the close of the exhibition,

- 1 In a letter written by Shore to Nellie Lowther and dated September 24, 1952, he states that it was on "this day" in 1937 that he first visited Macedon with Grandy. The letter, apparently unsent, is in Shore's correspondence files.
- 2 In his not-totally-reliable scrapbook summary of events, Shore gives May 1938 as the date of this holiday, although he was given a date at the Athenaeum "almost immediately" on his return. (AMSA, p193). The show opened on August 16.

thirteen or fourteen works had been sold for a total in excess of £300.¹

Critical responses will be examined more fully in Chapter 8; on the whole they were very favourable, although most reviewers managed to find fault with some aspect of the exhibition. The most enthusiastic comments were reserved for the landscapes, which must have strengthened Shore's resolve to move out of the city.

In comparison with his first one-man show, which he struggled to fill, the 1938 exhibition included some seventy oils and ten watercolours and drawings, drawn from

the residue of the Sydney show [from the previous year], several flowerpieces and still life, a couple of large landscapes painted in the studio, and most of the Mount Macedon sketches. (AMSA, p193)

In addition to some already considered², a number of paintings in this exhibition can be equated with extant works. One of these is Cheniston Road, Macedon (Pl 118), dated 1938 and so painted during the three-week holiday in that year.

2 The portrait of Mrs Grimwade (Pl 104) and the self-portrait Hot Days (Pl 109) were exhibited 'Not for sale'; Wattle Lodge Garden is probably the painting illustrated in Plate 116 (see footnote 1, p 247). In Shore's annotated catalogue to the exhibition, several exhibits are marked 'destroyed' or 'scrapped'; the sales book lists purchasers, but in many cases too anonymously (e.g. Miss Ises, Miss G. Holmes) for them now to be traced.

1 Prior to the opening, three exhibits were sold to Sir Keith and Lady Murdoch, and one to students of Geelong Grammar as a present for their departing music master, W.H. McKie. McKie visited the gallery before the opening and bought another (more expensive) work for himself. Both paintings, The Pointing Branch and Sunny Day, were taken to England. The sales book states that, in all, fourteen works were sold, but lists only thirteen titles with their prices.

For the first time we can see the emergence of the characteristic treatment of densely packed trees that was to become a feature of Shore's landscapes for the remainder of his career. In several further examples (Plates 119, 120 and 121, to cite only a few in public collections) the vertical grid-like pattern set up by a group of close-set trees provides the framework - even the entire subject matter - of the picture, with foliage, undergrowth and sky adding colour notes of accompaniment.

Black Forest, Macedon (Pl 122) also takes as its subject trees along a rough-made country road, but here Shore has chosen the vertical format which allows him to express more forcefully the upward thrust of the eucalypts. Compared with the slightly claustrophobic atmosphere of Cheniston Road, Black Forest opens out in its upper sections to reveal light patches of sky which emphasize by contrast the dark of the forest. This was one of the three works purchased from the exhibition by the Murdochs. On Sir Keith's death it was acquired by Aubrey Gibson, and in 1982 was purchased by the Warrnambool Art Gallery.

One other exhibit from the 1938 show which has found its way into a public collection is The Stable, Nandi (Pl 123). In 1939 it was given to Shore's niece, Mrs Bruce Ingles of Launceston, and was sold in 1981 to the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery. Compared with the predominating purples and browns of Black Forest, the colours in this painting are more typical of those used by Shore over the next decade, running through a seemingly endless variety of greens from the near-yellow to the near-black.

This spectrum of greens is also displayed in Jamieson River and Valley (Pl 114), which was painted during a motor trip through Victoria in 1938.¹ Shore has here again chosen the time-honoured elevated view of a lush river valley extending to distant hills. This work can be seen as a bridge between the 1936 Darling Street, South Yarra (Pl 94), with which it has in common a matt, two-dimensional surface of little textural variety, and the richer landscapes which followed.

* * *

Following the sale of his mother's house, Shore had moved into a small room in the same building as his studio in South Yarra. He was there for only a few months before he moved to Macedon at the beginning of 1939.

Shore's reasons for leaving Melbourne were manifold. That given to Russell Grimwade in refusing his offer of an overseas trip - that he wanted to see what he could do with the Australian bush - was genuine enough; his earliest manuscript ends on a similar, rather idealistic note (AMSA, p197):

Should my pictures be commonplace, or lacking in one way or many, then I was so, and looking at old or modern masters and travelling about the world would make no difference in the long run. I went off to Mount Macedon to set to work. Another reason, not mentioned in the first manuscript but admitted in AMSB, was Shore's wish to spend as much time with Grandy as possible.

1 Shore accepted an invitation to accompany "two elderly friends - a man and his wife." (AMSA, p195) Their identity is uncertain, but they were probably either the Stormonts or R.D.Elliott and his wife.

A third reason, and one which Shore expressed only in private, was his loathing of the political wranglings which flourished in the art world of Melbourne during the late thirties.¹ His attitude to the Australian Academy of Art was equivocal - like Frater's², but in direct contrast with Bell's. When invited to join the Academy in 1936, he deemed it an honour to be asked, but refused in deference to Bell's antipathy to the idea.

He did not approve of the Academy in principle (for the right reasons, believing it to be inimical to artistic innovation) but suggested to Bell that they join if invited, and work from within to promulgate the acceptance of modernism. The idea infuriated Bell. (AMSA, ppl63-4) Later, when free from Bell's influence, Shore did join the Academy and his works were included in the first exhibition in 1938.

That Shore opted for the Academy rather than the Contemporary Art Society was a matter as much of personalities as of artistic theories. He was increasingly to work in a style which came within the ambit of neither group, but in the less militant Academy he was under no pressure to explain or justify his work. This gave him the opportunity to explore freely and fully the individualistic style at which he had painstakingly arrived.

1 In an undated letter to Jan Minchin (cJune 1981), Justin Gill wrote: "Arnold Shore said that Art Politics was so revolting to him that he had to live in Macedon and work in Melbourne." Several other acquaintances of Shore's at the time (including Tom Henderson, Arthur Frater and Alan Sumner) attest to his distaste for art-political arguments and his amazement at the acrimony they aroused.

2 Frater at first refused to join the Academy, denouncing the scheme as reactionary; but a short time later he changed his mind and, with Shore, exhibited at the first Academy exhibition. Argus, May 15, 1937, pl6 and July 15, 1937, pl1.

Following the financial successes of 1938, Shore's income from his paintings during the Macedon period was moderate, but sufficient to prevent the too-rapid dwindling of his savings.¹ He did not retire completely from the hurly-burly of the capital. He continued to exhibit with the Twenty Melbourne Painters until 1946, and also regularly sent works to Sydney to be shown with the Contemporary Group and the Society of Artists. He mounted one-man shows in Melbourne in 1940, 1945 and 1946, and in Sydney in 1941.

Public recognition continued. In 1939 Still Life (Pears and Quinces) (Pl 125) was purchased by the Art Gallery of South Australia from the second Academy exhibition. From the 1940 one-man show at the Velasquez Gallery, the National Gallery of Victoria purchased The Vegetable Garden (Pl 135). The following year the Art Gallery of New South Wales bought its first Shore from the Macquarie Galleries exhibition; this was the atypical and somewhat retardataire Still Life (Pl 136) with its odd mixture of references to Chardin and Cézanne.

The vast majority of Shore's paintings from the war years are landscapes of the Macedon area. It was during this period that he forged the style which he was to develop fully and consistently only during the last years of his life. He occasionally reverted to the matt surfaces of such earlier works as Darling Street and Jamieson River and Valley, but the results are less successful than those in which varied surface textures are used to create forms.

1 His income from sales averaged just over £150 per annum for the years 1939-1947. His best year - 1945, when he held a one-man show at Georges Gallery - brought in £301; his worst, 1944, realised £54 (figures from sales book).

Shore's landscapes of the late thirties and forties, with very few exceptions, fall into two categories. The first consists of vertical format paintings of small sections of bush, free of human intrusion. Working within the constraints of a limited palette and often formless compositions, Shore manages to convey, through the unstintingly vigorous application of rich pigments, both the impenetrability of the bush and the life-force invested in it. There is no sense of mystery or foreboding as in the dense bush of the nineteenth century Heidelberg artists. Using what Harold Herbert described as "most unpromising subject matter,"¹ Shore simply and tellingly unfolds the beauty and power of the Australian bush.

Paintings in the second category are of a horizontal format, and exhibit some sign of domesticity, usually in the form of picturesque farm buildings. Despite the scope for greater variety in the combination of the products of man and nature, these works are seldom as successful as the pure bushscapes. Not only are buildings of this functional type less aesthetically pleasing than virgin bush; the works are less strikingly original because of their unavoidable visual associations with earlier artists' treatment of similar subject matter. Shore was the first to look in close-up detail at the microcosm of the bush for its own sake. Where he introduces cow-sheds or cultivated fields, the originality of his vision is diluted.

Occasional departures from this dichotomy of formats have been dictated by considerations beyond the immediate subject

1 In his review of Shore's 1938 one-man show, Argus, August 16, 1938, p14.

matter. Winter Toll (Pl 120) has a horizontal format and no direct sign of human habitation, but here Shore is not portraying the glory of the bush, but the devastation it can suffer at man's hands. The extent of that devastation is more graphically presented in a horizontal composition implying its continuation indefinitely in all directions.

Although man-made structures occupy much of the vertical-format picture surface of both The Turn of the Year (Pl 134) and Come into the Garden, Maud (Pl 126), the forces of nature predominate. In one case they threaten to over-run derelict farm buildings; in the other they encroach alarmingly on the substantial but potentially vulnerable verandah and its genteel occupants.

A selection of the more characteristic examples from the Macedon period demonstrates the range of effects Shore could create within the narrow confines of subject matter to which he chose to restrict himself. Two works in the Bendigo Art Gallery, both painted in 1946, provide examples which can be studied together of the two principal categories.

Noon (Pl 127) with its twisting, immature tree trunks and vibrant colours, typifies the vertical format bushscapes. A smooth patch of roadway in the lower right corner makes token acknowledgement of human intervention. Spring at Macedon (Pl 128) is far more peaceful. Native and imported varieties of tree coexist, their varied shades of green harmonizing smoothly over a cleared field.

The Park (Pl 119) assumes an enduring solidity through Shore's uncompromising emphasis on sheer tree trunks running the full depth of the picture surface. The rigid vertical

framework is softened by glimpses of pale blue sky and muted tones of foliage which provides a background rather than a covering for the bare trunks. By comparison, the trees in On Mt Towrong (Pl 130) sway gently against a luminous sky, the feathery delicacy of their foliage suggested by a shower of fine brushstrokes.

When buildings are introduced, and the canvas set on its longer edge, natural features still predominate. In each of Plates 131, 132 and 133, a mature tree is set centrally, partially obscuring the wooden building behind it. But by varying the season and his distance from the subject, Shore has achieved three strikingly different results. In Country Residence (Pl 131) the wintry atmosphere is evoked not only by duller colours, but also by smoother, dryer brushstrokes than are employed in bringing the other two studies to life.

At no stage had Shore completely renounced his passion for thick impasto, but during his time at Macedon he had generally reserved its most exuberant use for smaller oil sketches. For this reason some of the smaller works display a joyful vigour less apparent in many of the larger examples from this period. In The Fowl Yard (Pl 133) of 1945, an imaginative composition and the brilliant greens of the foliage, heightened by dashes of red in the hens' crests, create a sparkling little picture from a mundane subject. Occasionally in a larger work - The Pear Tree (Pl 132) of 1941 and Nandi (Pl 140) of 1943 are examples - a similarly vibrant effect is achieved using a more varied palette enlivened by touches of impasto.

In most of these landscapes, Shore has conformed to traditional concepts of balance and harmony in his composition. There is a central feature - a tree, a shed or a patch of distant sky - to which the eye is led by conventional perspectival devices. Even in those works where trees occupy almost all the picture space (Plates 119, 121), there is a strong sense of spatial recession. Shore was never to allow his interest in colour to over-ride his concern for the representation of the three-dimensional reality of the physical world. This was one of the strictures which prevented his fuller acceptance of many European masters from Matisse forwards.

In a group of sketches painted in the mid-forties, Shore shows a greater interest in variations of cloud formation, combining these studies with a yellower palette and flatter paintwork for the landscape features (Pl 138). By the end of the Macedon period, however, the sky resumes its subsidiary role, and his most common theme is again the depths of the bush where tree trunks and branches writhe contortedly amongst densely massed, multi-coloured foliage.

The feature which sets Shore's Macedon works apart from all earlier Australian landscapes is their bursting vitality. The bush is shown not as a peaceful backdrop to an excursion into the country, nor as a magnificent panorama to be admired from a distance, nor even as a sinister presence waiting to entrap wandering children. In Shore's paintings the bush is an infinitely varied, infinitely extensive collection of living organisms, existing quite independently of, and unrelated to, absent mankind.

The European artist to whom Shore comes closest in these works is Matthew Smith. In his landscapes of the late twenties and thirties, of which Winter Landscape, Frejus (Pl 137) is a typical example, Smith not only achieved a sense of movement - almost of individual personality - in his trees, but he did so using techniques very similar to those arrived at by Shore a few years later. Brilliant colours have been applied lavishly to the canvas in expansive swirling strokes and shorter nervous jabs. .

Similarities between the personalities of Shore and Smith have been mentioned (p), but their careers had still more in common. They came under like influences at much the same age - Smith at first hand and Shore through reproductions. Smith painted Lilies (Pl 71) in 1914, at the age of thirty-five, following several years in France where he studied briefly under Matisse. At the same age, in the early thirties, Shore was concentrating on flower studies and making a conscious effort partially to renounce elements in his work which he considered to be too closely modelled on Matisse,

By 1922, when he was forty-two, Smith had grown "certain that by his too close study and assimilation of Post-Impressionists, even of Cézanne and of the Fauves, he had built himself what he described ... as a spiritual prison."¹ From that time he began to develop the richer, more painterly technique exemplified in Winter Landscape, Frejus. Shore turned forty-two in 1939, the year he moved to Macedon. His turning away from the direct influences of post-impressionism and fauvism had taken place more gradually

1 Rothenstein, J., Matthew Smith, Beaverbrook, London, 1962, p4.

throughout the thirties, but it was the move to Macedon which confirmed his independence from them.

Two comments on the work of Matthew Smith, one by Roger Fry and the other by Augustus John, could as well apply to Shore's best work of the Macedon period. Fry described Smith as

pushing to the furthest limits the essentially modern view of the functional as opposed to the ornamental role played by colour.

And John wrote that

he casts upon the canvas a pageant of grandiose and voluptuous form and sumptuous colour which are none the less controlled by an ordered design and a thoroughly learned command of technique.¹

It would be possible to explain the similarities between the careers and work of Smith and Shore in terms of common influences - among them Van Gogh's serpentine, sculptural foliage, Matisse's purity of colour, Vlaminck's rich pigments and straight-from-the-tube technique and Soutine's vigour. The direct influence of Smith on Shore, however, should not be neglected. Examples of his work were regularly reproduced in magazines available in Melbourne throughout the thirties.

In 1948, the year Shore began working at the NGV, the Gallery purchased Smith's Provencal Landscape 1 (Pl 117). This painting, though undated, is in the style of Smith's landscapes from the middle thirties. Stylistic connections

1 Both quoted in Rothenstein, op.cit., p4.

between Shore and Smith emerged much earlier than this, but the acquisition must have gratified Shore, and first-hand familiarity with this typically vigorous example of Smith's work may well have inspired him in his bolder experiments of the late fifties. The bright oranges and yellows of Provencal Landscape 1 can also be seen as a likely influence on the broader palette Shore adopted when he resumed painting in 1949 (see p).

Of the major British artists active between the wars, Smith stands out for his use of brilliant colour and his emotion-charged application of paint at a time when most of his contemporaries had adopted a more intellectual approach. From the subdued colours of Duncan Grant and Vanessa Bell (though there are exceptions) through the evocatively disturbing landscapes of Paul Nash to the abstractions of Ben Nicholson there runs a carefully controlled asceticism which has no part in Smith's work. Shore, like Smith, was artistically an isolate. Like Smith's, his work, compared with that of his contemporaries, was based more on emotion than on theory.

* * * * *

Shore moved to Sydney in February 1947 and returned to Melbourne the following December.¹ During his months in Sydney, most of his painting was done in the area around Turramurra, where he lived with the Lemanns. The Little Hill, Wahroonga (Pl 139) employs the limited palette of greens familiar from earlier Macedon works such as Spring at Macedon (Pl 128) of 1946; the paint, however, is applied more thickly with a greater use of the palette knife. This richer impasto marks a reversion to the more tactile surfaces of the thirties, which were to recur even more pronouncedly in later years.

Shore's 1947 one-man exhibition, held in June at Sydney's Macquarie Galleries, resulted in only three sales, but one of these was Bush, N.S.W. (Pl 142), bought by the Art Gallery of New South Wales. This painting joined three other Shores which the Gallery had purchased between 1941 and 1943.² Bernard Smith, for the catalogue of the Gallery's collection, established that Bush, N.S.W. was executed in May 1947.³

- 1 These dates are given by Shore at the beginning of his first scrapbook in a summary of important events in his life. Their reliability, however, is suspect (for instance, he gives 1931 as the year of opening of the Bell-Shore school). That his return to Melbourne may have been earlier than December is suggested by the fact that already in that month the newly formed National Gallery Society, at the instigation of its president Daryl Lindsay, had allocated funds for the appointment of Shore as a guide-lecturer, Cox, *op.cit.*, p204. Shore had visited Lindsay informally at the Gallery after his return, and Lindsay had then raised the possibility of a guide-lectureship. "When I said that I must find work of some kind . . . [Lindsay] said there was a possibility of his persuading the National Gallery Society, of which he was President, to put up funds to provide a guide-lecturer." (AMSB, p138)
- 2 Still Life (1940) and The Park (1941), both purchased in 1941, and Country Residence, executed and purchased in 1943; Plates 136, 119, 131 respectively.
- 3 Catalogue of Australian Oil Paintings in the National Art Gallery of New South Wales, 1876-1952, Sydney, 1953.

Most of the surface is painted with dry brushstrokes which, taken in combination with the restricted palette of browns and olive-greens, give the painting a subdued uniformity of tone unusual for Shore. This could be seen as a period of emotional hiatus between the more light-hearted Macedon period, and the depression which mounted as Grandy's condition worsened.

Another Sydney work, Angophora Tree (Pl 141)¹, prefigures the more tortured tree forms of the late fifties (Pl 167). An obvious parallel can be drawn between these studies and Shore's disturbed mental state. The years at Macedon were the happiest he had enjoyed, and when he allowed his colour sense full rein, this joyousness was reflected in the best works of the early and middle forties. By contrast, the months leading up to Grandy's death were increasingly difficult. That Angophora Tree was painted late in this period is confirmed by its non-inclusion in the Macquarie Galleries exhibition. Shore did no work in Sydney after Grandy's death.

The period spanning the war years brought Shore's painting close to its full maturity. His decision to move to Macedon in 1939 had an immense influence on his painting. It removed him from the bickering of the various art-political factions developing in Melbourne, allowed him to escape the encroachment of artistic movements with which he felt little sympathy, and provided him with the opportunity to develop his painting along lines with which he felt most comfortable.

1 The painting is inscribed on the reverse "Angophora Tree, Turrumurra, N.S.W."

This involved a renunciation of several influences which had informed his work during the twenties, and which had continued to surface in examples throughout the thirties. They included the stark colour contrasts of the fauves, the flat unmodulated planes of Gauguin, the integrated picture surface of (in their different ways) Matisse and the neo-impressionists, and Cezanne's approach to the structure of form.

The techniques Shore employed during the forties - the generous application with brush and knife of unadulterated colour - were not so much new as purer. He had used them in sections of certain flowerpieces of the early thirties, but never before so consistently. It was his new choice of subject matter, in particular the expansive, living forms of the Australian bush, which provided full scope for the exercise of his colouristic skill.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE LATER YEARS - 1949-1963

This last period began auspiciously for Shore, with his late marriage, but he continued to be beset by bouts of severe depression. In the years following his resumption of painting he produced some outstanding works, but they were outnumbered by mundane offerings lacking conviction, and reflecting an uncertainty of direction.

Pressure of work and his mental condition depleted Shore's output in the middle fifties, and it was not until 1957, relieved of his commitments at the National Gallery of Victoria and granted temporary respite from his depression, that he resumed painting with the fervour of the war years. When he did so, he showed that he had lost none of his powers. He devoted the last six years of his life to endlessly varied exploration of the fields he had discovered, and made his own, in the forties.

Although he did not retrieve his painting equipment from Sydney until mid-1949, Shore managed to produce a few sketches in the early part of that year. There exist several studies in watercolour, crayon, ink and pastel completed during his trip to Broken Hill in March 1949.

An eagerness to return to painting is suggested by his willingness to tackle unpromising and unfamiliar subjects. In the watercolour Old Workings, Broken Hill (Pl 143), subtle cloud effects lighten the towering bulk of three mullock heaps. Less successful is Hotel, Broken Hill (Pl 145), sketched from his hotel balcony, in which the task of

rendering a night sky with pastel proves to be beyond the artist's limited experience in the medium.

The most powerful of the Broken Hill works is the crayon sketch In the Cage (Pl 147), in which an element of drama is added to the everyday scene of miners returning to the surface after a shift underground. The bold outlines of the miners' features are submerged in a multitude of light crayon strokes covering the surface of the sketch. There is a confidence in the delineation of these faces matched by none of Shore's more conventional figure studies.

This work, in its harsh spontaneity, shows the influence of the early twentieth century work of Rouault and Van Dongen. It bears several striking similarities to Rouault's At the Mirror (Pl 146) of 1906: the broad dark outlines; the neutral colour scheme bordered by flashes of red; even a more than superficial resemblance between the profile features of the principal figures. Shore is virtually certain to have been familiar with this widely reproduced example of Rouault's work.

In his paintings of the next few years, Shore drew on a variety of the artists who had influenced him more or less strongly during the twenties and thirties. In researching his guided-tour lectures for the NGV, he would have exposed himself more concertedly to the work of European masters than at any previous stage of his career. At a time of considerable personal uncertainty, and following a long period of artistic inactivity, it was to be expected that his experiments would take an eclectic turn.

Shore executed at least one oil painting in the early part of 1949. Orchard, Nandi (Pl 148) is inscribed on the reverse: "To Bill Oliver 3.3.1949 Souvenir of our Saturday 26.2.49 a lovely day." It was probably painted with equipment borrowed from Oliver, who had been a close friend since the late twenties.

Shore, then, chose to return to the scene of his happy memories from the early forties, and other dated works indicate that he made the trip to Macedon on several later occasions. Orchard, Nandi has been painted from the end of the vegetable patch opposite that used for The Vegetable Garden of 1939 (Pl 135). It shows that the year's absence from painting had done nothing to diminish Shore's vigour. The choice of colours and the application of paint are close to those of the Macedon paintings from the mid-forties.

The break from painting may have freshened his outlook; from 1949 he found a wider range of subject matter, and experimented with a broader palette. Although not many works are known from 1949 and the early fifties, those few include some of Shore's strongest and most colourful.

In The Store, Smith's Creek (Pl 150) he has extended his colour range into bright reds and oranges. Both the colours and the subject matter - small commercial premises with lettering on the facade - suggest a familiarity with the work of Utrillo (Pl 149). Utrillo's influence can be seen more strongly in Frater's series of street scenes from the forties, mostly painted around the Fitzroy area, but occasionally having a more rural flavour (Pl 144).

Frater, still a close friend of Shore's, often painted in the Smith's Creek area, and he may have had a more direct influence on The Store, Smith's Creek. Shore's technique is still more richly textural than either Frater's or Utrillo's, and more suited to natural than to man-made elements. Buildings were to appear only infrequently, and usually in subsidiary roles, in the works of the fifties and sixties.

Stable at Nandi (Pl 151), also completed in 1949, displays an equally varied, if less brilliant, palette. This makes an interesting comparison with the pre-war work, The Stable, Nandi (Pl 123), painted from an identical position. In the intervening years, the land beyond the stable has been cleared, but allowing for this and the different seasons prevailing, it can be seen that Shore's treatment of individual details has changed very little in a decade.

If anything, the later version represents a reversion to traditional tonal values. The flame-coloured trees in the fore- and middle-ground could have been painted around Heidelberg in the 1890s, and the treatment of distant hills draws on the same heritage. The stable itself is more carefully and naturalistically represented than in the 1938 work, and both lack the freedom and dash of Penleigh Boyd's Studio of 1930 (Pl 65).

While at Macedon, with an abundance of varied landscape subjects within walking distance of the guest house, Shore rarely attempted one of the flower studies which had constituted such a large proportion of his earlier output. Back in Melbourne, with no car, he was reliant on friends to transport him to the countryside he still preferred to paint.

There was no shortage of offers, but occasionally circumstances dictated that he paint in his studio, and he again began to produce flowerpieces.

One of the earliest of these is Vegetable Flower Piece (Pl 152) of 1949¹, in which Shore has completely subdued his interest in colour to produce a work which is almost monochromatic. This is a study of textures and tones in which the artist displays his masterly control of these elements by managing to maintain interest and variety throughout the composition.

In its concentration of greens, Vegetable Flower Piece invites comparison with the 1940 work, Still Life with Cabbages (Pl 153). Shore's aims in these two works are quite different. Though both can be seen, in part, as an exploration of textures, he is concerned in Vegetable Flower Piece with convincingly representing the vase and its contents. In Still Life with Cabbages the subject is unimportant; the aim is to create a harmony of near-abstract forms. In this work, as in Special Washing (Pl 85), Shore showed a glimpse of an appreciation of the issues underlying the development of twentieth century European art. By 1949, however, he had temporarily lost sight of this vision.

White Hibiscus (Pl 154) of 1951 is more loosely handled than Vegetable Flower Piece. Paint is applied with more assurance to produce a unified work free of the rather stilted formality of the earlier composition. White Hibiscus is one of Shore's most accomplished flowerpieces, but

1 The sales book records that this work was painted at Nandi about 1945-6, and repainted in East Melbourne in 1949. It bears the date 1949.

stylistically it is hardly more advanced, in any direction, than several flower studies from the early thirties. Convulvulus (Pl 67) and Joseph Brown's Flower Study (Pl 88), in particular, display as much assurance, and as convincingly capture the evanescent freshness of the flowers. Admittedly flower studies had not occupied a large proportion of his time, but in the intervening twenty years Shore had managed only to come full circle in his attempts to bring flowers to life in paint.

In another flower study painted two years later (Pl 155) the delicate control of White Hibiscus is no longer evident. Colour contrasts are raw, leaves and petals are heavily outlined in black, and there is a frenzied quality to the odd assortment of casually arranged flowers balanced on a table of ambiguous form. There may be more of Van Gogh and more of Cézanne in this work than in the earlier flowerpieces just considered, but post-impressionist elements have been grafted coarsely onto the subject, instead of being thoughtfully assimilated as in Shore's better work of the twenties and thirties.

By 1953, when this work was painted, the uplifting experience of fatherhood which had so elated him had lost its impetus.¹ He did not undergo his next series of shock treatments until January 1954, but the paucity of works from 1953 suggests that he was suffering from depression (which invariably reduced his desire to paint) for some months prior to the treatment.

1 Of the period following his son's birth in August 1952, Shore wrote: "a year passed very happily." (AMSB, p156)

During the early years of his marriage, however, Shore managed to produce some other fine work. In Avoca House, South Yarra (Pl 156) of 1950, the broader palette of the previous year has been utilised to the full, resulting in a light-filled picture of striking freshness. Richly varied textures in the foliage are thrown into relief by smoother passages in the sky and the building. This work represents one of Shore's most successful blendings of natural and man-made elements. He has regained the power of his most vigorous Macedon landscapes, diluted only by the more civilized nature of his subject.

His heavy commitments in Melbourne did not prevent Shore from escaping to the country for occasional painting forays. The majority of the paintings exhibited and sold during the early fifties were landscapes painted in semi-rural districts within an hour's drive of Melbourne. Whittlesea, Yan Yean, South Morang and, particularly, Eden Park - all to the north and north-east of the city - recur often in titles, inscriptions, and descriptions in the sales book.

Many are slight sketches in crayon and watercolour, or oil studies quickly dashed off on small pieces of composition board. Some of these, though, evoke the spirit of rural Australia more convincingly than the few larger-scale works which were finished in the studio. In Trees near Whittlesea (Pl 158) and Rural Landscape (Pl 159), both small oil sketches from 1952, Shore has turned his attention from the green of the bush to the yellow of summer pasture. The sun-whitened gums and a generally much lighter palette accurately convey the still heat of a summer day.

By comparison, the larger Old Farm, South Morang (Pl 160) appears cluttered and slightly overworked; the greens, lacking sufficient variation, blend into one another, submerging individual features.

Only a trickle of paintings was produced during the years 1954 to 1956. Shore continued to exhibit with the Twenty Melbourne Painters and the Victorian Artists' Society, but very few pictures have survived. One of these is Haystacks (Pl 161), painted in 1956 and exhibited with the V.A.S. in the autumn of that year. Certain elements are recognizably Shore's, but the colour control and verve of earlier work is missing. The remainder of the known work from this period consists of crayon or watercolour sketches of which South Morang (Pl 162) is a typical example. The drawing is facile, but uninspired, and the colour insipid.

Following his recovery in hospital from a severe bout of depression early in 1957, and coinciding with his acceptance of the position of art critic for the Age, a new and highly productive period of work began.

Many of the works of the late fifties were painted in the coastal regions of Airey's Inlet and Anglesea, in company with Frater and Bill Millane. The rugged rock faces rising from the beach attracted Shore with their richly textured surfaces (Plates 163, 164). He adapted his techniques for heavily massed foliage to the earth tones of these rock formations, stressing the play of light across their surfaces, and imbuing the massive forms with a life-like individuality.

Until this time, rocky coastlines had been ignored as subject matter by most artists in Australia. Only the most

traditional artists used them, usually as a backdrop to shipwrecks or, as in many examples by J. Swinton Diston, to show monolithic rock outcrops in the role of stygian sentinels. John Peter Russell's lyrical seascapes are the obvious exception, and if Shore was familiar with them¹, they must be seen as a strong influence.

A more certain influence is Monet's Bad Weather at Etretat, which Shore would have analysed on innumerable occasions for the benefit of those accompanying his guided tours around the Gallery. Shore's interest in light effects in these coastal studies parallels the concerns of the impressionists, but the manner in which the solidity of the rocks is conveyed with broad, sharply angled sweeps of a loaded brush shows again a familiarity with Cézanne, whose influence was not seen to a great extent during the Macedon period.

When he stayed at Airey's Inlet, the virgin country away from the beach also provided Shore with ample material to continue his portrayal of the character of the Australian bush. Many of these studies concentrate exclusively on tree forms, excluding the sky and even the ground beneath the trees to produce patterns of intertwining trunks, boughs and foliage which approach the abstract (Pl 165).

By the last years of his life, Shore could acknowledge, with reservations, the validity of abstract painting:

to be opposed to abstract art, merely because much of it is bad, seems to me unintelligent. At the same time I

1 Shore would certainly have known Russell's Portrait of Dr Maloney, purchased through the Felton Bequest in 1943, but, in Ann Galbally's words, "most of John Peter Russell's paintings remained in French and family collections until the late 1960s." Galbally, A., The Art of John Peter Russell, Sun, Melbourne, 1977, p97.

believe any abstract art of importance must be related to the underlying laws of nature. If a picture is to mean anything to you, me and Joe Smith, it must talk to us of the basic things of our existence.¹

Although in many of his bushscapes from this last period it is difficult immediately to identify the subject (Plates 166, 167), all were painted directly from nature. The landscape before him is, rather than the subject of the painting, the stepping-off point for explorations of relationships between colours and shapes. In a few rare cases, the subject is sacrificed entirely, as in Red Gum of 1962 (Pl 168).

This progression from natural tree forms to abstract forms based on them inevitably invites comparison with Mondrian's tree series from fifty years earlier. But Mondrian's development towards the abstract was systematic, controlled by the intellect, and supported by the artist's philosophical theories; Shore's was haphazard, incomplete, and reliant on the quirks of his disturbed emotions.

He would have denied the conscious assimilation into his own work of elements of other artists' styles, while acknowledging that such assimilation was unavoidable. References to the work of a variety of past and contemporary masters continued to surface in his paintings. The lighter colours and loosely integrated planes of Cliff Face, Jerusalem Bay (Pl 166) carry a suggestion of de Kooning's influence; paint has been applied to the surface of

1 Quoted in Hetherington, op.cit., p71. Hetherington's interview with Shore took place in 1962.

Bush, Smith's Creek (Pl 170) in many different ways, echoing the concerns of Jackson Pollock and other abstract expressionists; Forest Gums, Flowerdale (Pl 171) even bears a resemblance in overall effect to Pollock's Blue Poles.

Other Australian artists had begun to follow paths, if not particularly close to Shore's, at least suggestive of similar concerns. By the late fifties there had emerged in the work of Fred Williams an 'abstract' element comparable to that in Shore's. The term is used here in the sense in which it was originally applied to painting; the artist, by simplifying his forms and banishing incidentals, seeks to abstract the essence of his subject - in the case of both Shore and Williams, the distinctive character of the Australian bush.

John Perceval's landscapes from the same period come still closer to Shore's. In Landscape with Wildflowers (Pl 169), Perceval projects his tree forms forward from the uniformly congested picture space with rich strokes of pigment in a manner remarkably similar to that used by Shore. Despite the disparity in their ages, Shore and Perceval had maintained a fond regard for each other for over twenty years, and may be seen as mutually influencing each other.

However, when the bushscapes of Shore's last period are compared with those from the forties, no major change in approach is evident: the paint is a little more lavishly applied, with more freely abandoned brushstrokes, and the colours are rather more varied, but these can be seen as natural extensions of the techniques of the forties, arising from Shore's increased self-assurance in his work.

The nightmarish contortions of tree trunks and branches can be found as early as 1947 in Angophora Tree (Pl 141), painted in Sydney under the stress of Grandy's declining health. The similarity of this work to several from the late fifties raises the question of Shore's mental state during the later period. Between the severe bouts of depression for which he received treatment, he may never have been far from the point of breakdown.

Although the overwhelming majority of Shore's work from this last period of his life were landscapes, he also painted several flowerpieces and a handful of other subjects. The flowerpieces display the same trends that emerge in the landscapes. Paint is applied thickly to produce surfaces in which the volume of leaves and flowers is expressed as much through a texture approaching relief sculpture as through more conventional, painterly devices. No great distinction is made between principal subject and background, producing an all-over effect in which individual details disappear (Pl 172).

Some of Shore's later works - most of those which do not conform to his own individual style of landscape or flower study - appear positively retardataire. The large portrait of the blind artist Alice Panton (Pl 173) differs in no important respect from Shore's portraits of the thirties. The sitter's insistence on wearing a suit the colour of which combined unhappily with her tartan plaid made Shore's task more difficult, but his choice of background colours has done nothing to alleviate the problem.¹ The treatment

1 The preliminary pen-and-ink sketch (Pl 174) is a more revealing, if less flattering portrait of Miss Panton which does not suffer from the disconcerting colour clashes of the oil.

of the background is very like that learned from Frater and used in most of the thirties portraits, and the facial modelling is indistinguishable from that in the portraits of Lady Baldwin Spencer and Lady Barrett (Plates 79, 80).

The same cannot be said of the arrestingly honest self-portrait from 1962 (Pl 110). Patrick McGaughey's apt description has already been quoted (see p235). In this portrait Shore has successfully transferred his vigorous impasto technique, tempering it only slightly in the face to accommodate the expression of suspicious caution. The daringly juxtaposed colours, defying all rules of harmony, the turmoil of the background, the bristling plant form rising from a vase which itself glares accusingly out of the picture, all combine to accentuate the pressures which Shore saw as threatening him.

Two uncharacteristically large works, also from 1962, show that Shore's vibrant depictions of living forms are seen to best advantage on a small scale. The canvases on which they are painted originally carried works by Rupert Bunny, a close friend of Shore's.¹ The canvases were bequeathed to Shore

1 Shore's correspondence file contains letters from Bunny written in a tone which suggests a close friendship. The earliest of these (a letter of condolence on the death of Shore's mother) is dated March 23, 1938, but Shore almost certainly knew Bunny during his stay in Australia in 1928. Frater and Bunny were certainly close friends then, as a letter from Bunny to Frater, dated September 11, 1928 (in Bernard Smith's possession) reveals. Frater and Shore were at that time constant companions, and it can be assumed that Bunny and Shore met then.

on the understanding that they would be painted over.¹

The vegetation in Back Garden (Pl 175) is overwhelmed by the rectilinear forms which occupy the greater part of the picture surface. Seen at close hand, the central sections shimmer with light and colour, but the painting as a whole, seen at a distance as it must be, appears static.

In The Sideboard (Pl 176) too, broad straight bands of brown control the composition. The floral arrangement fails to enliven the whole because it fails in itself to convey the impression of flowers. In an excess of integration of the floral elements, Shore has succeeded only in creating a conglomeration of thick flecks of paint. At the other end of the sideboard, the artist has reverted to a tonal rendering of the framed photograph and maroon vase which pays unintentional homage to the earliest important influence on his work - the teachings of Max Meldrum.

Another exceptional work, unique in Shore's oeuvre in both size and method of construction, is Ideal Landscape (Pl 177). Jointly conceived by Shore and Teresa Vigano as a backdrop for floorshows at Mario's Restaurant, it consists of pieces of cloth cut out and glued to an enormous (205 x 504 cm.) sheet of heavy cotton. Mme Vigano, herself an artist influenced strongly by Frater and to a smaller extent by

1 Mrs Shore has recounted the circumstances of this gift. The executors of Bunny's estate, among them Daryl Lindsay, decided that the canvases should not be sold or exhibited, as they were unworthy of the artist, but that the high-quality French canvas should not be wasted. Several canvases were given to Shore, who painted over the Bunny pictures, reversed the canvases on their stretchers, and executed his own works on the reverse side. Other canvases went to Frater, who painted Mount Bogong (now in the NGV) on one of them.

Shore, selected the pieces of cloth but the cutting and construction were all Shore's work. He spent Tuesdays visiting exhibitions and writing his reviews for the Age, and the rest of the time, for six weeks during 1959, at Mario's working on the collage.

The subject, a forest glade hemmed round by densely massed trees, is not greatly different from his crowded bushscapes of this period, but the collage conveys an eerie, fairytale atmosphere totally at odds with his open-air, painted responses to nature.

Despite the restrictions imposed by the collage method, the great size of the canvas, and the vivid colour contrasts of the materials, Shore has managed to blend the different plant forms into a comprehensible and convincing whole, while retaining much of the boundless vitality of his paintings - a remarkable achievement.

For several years Ideal Landscape hung in the position for which it was designed, on a wall at Mario's, until it was slightly damaged by a fire at the restaurant. It was then transferred to the National Gallery of Victoria, and was purchased by the Gallery from the estate of Mme Vignano in 1971.

To concentrate unduly on exceptions, however, does not do justice to Shore. His reputation should depend less on his role as a protagonist of modernism than on the quality and originality of his portrayals of the Australian landscape. It was during the last few years of his life that he most fully realized these characteristics in his paintings.

Bolstered by the knowledge that his contribution to Australian art had finally been recognized, and encouraged by the production by younger artists whose importance had already been acknowledged of work clearly showing his influence, Shore worked with a new confidence and conviction. The corpus of works he produced in this final period includes some of his most powerful and eloquent statements, but they display links with the landscapes of the Macedon period sufficiently strong to confirm that they may be seen as extensions of his experiments during the forties.

Shore continued to set himself new problems, and until the end of his life kept finding new solutions. During his last six years he maintained the principle by which he operated until 1957, and which he summed up in the title of his retrospective exhibition in that year: 'Forty Years Seek and Find'.

The exhibition was successful in terms of both sales¹ and critical attention. Alan McCulloch wrote:

There is a general tendency among present -day students to leap from the Heidelberg days to the present without paying due attention to the transitional period. One of the important figures of this neglected era is Arnold Shore, as his current exhibition . . . shows.²

1 The financial success of the exhibition can be inferred from Shore's description of it as his "most successful exhibition by far, up to date." (AMSB, pl62) Shore's copy of the catalogue is not annotated, and the sales book makes no mention of the exhibition. The available information on sales is therefore limited to the two works bought by the NGV, and Bush, Smith's Creek (Pl 170), bought secretly by Shore's wife, and kept hidden from him for several weeks.

2 Herald, July 22, 1957.

John Brack, writing for the Age, was more eulogistic, if rather less objective, describing the exhibition as "the most important individual event of the season." "The country has so far resisted all attempts to paint the true Australian landscape," he wrote, but Shore "has come as close to it as anyone, and possibly, now and then, a shade closer."¹

The exhibition gave a thorough coverage of Shore's career, presenting for the first time a representation of his work sufficiently comprehensive for an assessment of his contribution to Australian art to be made. The only period lacking depth was that prior to 1930, represented by five oils²; but there were no fewer than twenty-three works from the thirties and twenty from the forties. These early works had been lent by private owners, or were catalogued as in the artist's collection; most of the large number of more recent paintings were for sale.

Further successful exhibitions followed, including one at the Moreton Galleries in Brisbane in 1960. Following his two terms as president of the Victorian Artists' Society, Shore held a one-man show in the Society's rooms in 1962 which resulted in a considerable number of sales and further favourable reviews. This was Shore's last major exhibition before his death.

Since that time, three more exhibitions have been devoted to his work. Both the Hawthorn City Art Gallery in 1969 and the Castlemaine Art Gallery in 1973 chose Shore's works for the opening exhibition in their new galleries.

1 Age, July 22, 1957.

2 Self Portrait (Pl 7), Mandarins (Pl 9), Chinese Figure (Pl 10), The Circus (Pl 37) and Union Street, Windsor (Pl 42).

In both cases a selection of works from the thirties and forties augmented a larger number from later years, but neither exhibition could approach the depth of the 1957 retrospective.

'The Later Work of Arnold Shore', held at the Powell Street Gallery in 1977, concentrated on paintings completed between 1957 and 1963.¹ In his foreword to the catalogue, Patrick McCaughey stressed the new vision of the Australian landscape which Shore had revealed in the works of his last six years. While accepting that the paintings of these years, considered as a group, are clearly distinguishable from Shore's earlier works, the author believes that they differ in degree rather than in kind.

When Professor McCaughey writes that, in his latest work, Shore "abandoned his earlier rather carefully shaded and constructed manner in favour of a direct application of pure colour," he exaggerates the distinctions between the paintings of the late fifties and sixties and those of the forties, as can be seen in the Macedon paintings from 1940 and 1946 illustrated in Plates 129 and 127.

These are not isolated examples, and Shore's exultant use of pure colour could be traced further back (at least as far as 1932 and the Flower Study in Joseph Brown's collection, Plate 88) without stretching the point.

1 It also included the 1938 self-portrait Hot Days (Pl 109) for specific comparison with the late self-portrait (Pl 110) and one Mount Macedon landscape from 1950.

Some of the earlier works are certainly more carefully structured in the sense of conforming to a traditional concept of composition, but even in this respect, examples can be found which erode the validity of Professor McCaughey's distinctions.

Is Iron Barks, Kinglake (Pl 179), the work chosen for the cover of the 1977 catalogue, intrinsically less structured than Summer, Mt. Towrong (Pl 121) of 1939? Arguably the later work is more classically composed, with its centrally placed gum, and clearer distinction between foreground and background. Country Track (Pl 178) of 1961 is more frenetically painted than the 1938 work Cheniston Road (Pl 118), and more colourful than Windy Day (Pl 124) from 1944, but the similarities of conception and the developmental connections are as striking as these differences.

Shore's ceaseless production of paintings, especially in the last year of his life, and his near frenzied application of paint were the outpourings of an anguished mind never far from a breakdown during his late period. These works display, to a greater extent than the paintings of the war years, a consistency of technique which reflects the assurance of a mature artist who has come fully to terms with his art. They are most appropriately seen as the culmination of a consistent line of development of which all the earlier works form a part.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE CHANGING CRITICAL CLIMATE 1918-1946

The purpose of this chapter is to reconstruct the pall of critical opinion which hung over Melbourne during the twenties, constricting the development of the city's artists, and to demonstrate how the reactionary prejudices which constituted it were gradually dispersed through the thirties and early forties. By concentrating on reviewers' comments on Arnold Shore's work, the development of which has already been examined in detail, it will be possible to compare the receptions granted the more and less innovatory work of one artist, precluding to a large extent any question of personal favouritism.¹

If an artist were to stay at the same remove from his critics' current tastes, his reception at their hands would not improve although both artist and critics may be advancing. This was not the case, however, with Shore. He made a forward leap in the mid-twenties which took him outside the range of all local critical appreciation, but over the next decade, while continuing to experiment with different styles, he moved not much further beyond the bounds which had obtained at the time of his initial break.

Although it will be impossible entirely to disentangle trends in Shore's painting from trends in the critical climate, his work of the thirties provides a relatively stable yardstick against which mellowing critical opinion

1 This should not be interpreted as a slur on the integrity of art critics in general, or of those included in this survey. More firmly founded conclusions can be reached if the 'artist' variable is eliminated from the investigation.

can be measured. Part of the sharp improvement in his critical reception may be attributed to a tempering on his part of some of the more aggressively modern aspects of his work; but the explanation for the greater part of it lies in the growing willingness of Melbourne critics to consider seriously more advanced modes of expression.

This new broadmindedness on the part of critics was bound to extend to Melbourne eventually (its belated arrival itself warrants attention), but Shore's steadfast belief in the validity of modern art and in himself hastened the transformation by persistently forcing reviewers to examine and discuss his work.

The earliest exhibitions in which Shore took part were the Annual and Spring Exhibitions of the Victorian Artists' Society in 1917 and 1918. None of his entries, however, attracted the attention of reviewers having to select for comment a few from a forbiddingly extensive list of exhibits.

Shore's name first appeared in reviews of the Meldrum Group exhibitions. In the Argus review of the inaugural exhibition held in September 1919, Shore was included in a list of artists whose work, despite the uniformity of presentation, "inevitably attracts particular notice."¹ By the time of the third Meldrum Group exhibition, the same reviewer saw fit to name three of Shore's works in a selection of "remarkably well-painted still life and flower studies . . . [which] possess fine qualities of light and space, and in

1 Argus, September 10, 1919, p11. The other artists listed were Richard McCann, A.E. Newbury and William Rowell.

addition are brilliant in colour scheme."¹

Even allowing for some darkening of the surface, it now seems extraordinary that Blue Hydrangeas (Pl 13, assuming it to have been the work exhibited in 1921) could have been so described. This demonstrates the extent to which the public had been indoctrinated with the virtues of the dark, tonal still lifes which had been favoured by the Royal Academy during the nineteenth century, and whose acceptance had been perpetuated by the teachings and Gallery directorship of Bernard Hall.

Following this encouraging review, Shore was ignored by the critics for several years, until they began to vent their derision on his experiments of the mid-twenties. The still life Chinese Figure exhibited in London in 1923 (Pl 10) failed to attract the attention either of the London reviewers or of P.G.Konody, who wrote a lengthy article on the exhibition for Art in Australia in which he specifically mentioned the "scarcity of still life paintings."²

From 1923, Shore exhibited with the Twenty Melbourne Painters, and reviews of this society's shows furnish the only critical comment on his work for the period during which it changed most dramatically. Although his self-portrait was reproduced in the 1923 catalogue, no reviewer in the daily press considered his entries worthy of mention. The Age critic proclaimed his own position with a eulogistic

1 Argus, May 3, 1921, p10. The three Shores praised were A Bowl of Roses, Bowl of Grapes, and Blue Hydrangeas, the last of which was probably the work now in the Art Gallery of Western Australia (Pl 13).

2 Konody, P.G., 'The Australian Exhibition in London', A in A, 3:7, March 1924.

assessment of the flower studies of A.M.E.Bale; he described her Dahlias as "equal to anything we have seen here or elsewhere," adding that it "would be a charming addition to any gallery in the world."¹

The following year Shore fared no better, and the critics for both the Age and the Sun compared the general standard of TMP entries unfavourably with those in the concurrent exhibition of the Australian Art Association. Even the presence of Miss Bale's work could not forestall the Age critic's description of the whole show as "a lamentable display of artistic incapacity." By comparison the AAA exhibition was "without doubt the finest exhibition of Australian art held in Victoria."²

The first specific mention of Shore in a TMP review occurred in the Argus in 1925, where he was credited with achieving, in Long 'Un, "an excellent feeling of light and space . . . in addition to a successful likeness of the model."³ This work was also included in the one-man show in 1929, at which time it was cited by three reviewers as an example of Shore's earlier (more traditional) style.⁴

It has been argued in Chapter 3 that the breakdown which Shore suffered in the mid-twenties occurred in the early months of 1925, and that at least some of his entries in

1 Age, August 1, 1923, p12.

2 Age, November 19, 1924, p10. The AAA, founded in 1912, represented the Establishment in Australian art. Its list of members in 1924 included virtually every artist from the upper echelons of public approval currently residing in Australia.

3 Argus, September 15, 1925, p6.

4 Sun, August 13, 1929; Age, August 13, 1929; Table Talk, August 22, 1929.

the 1925 TMP exhibition were painted considerably earlier. Long 'Un may date from as early as the Chinese Figure, which was also included in the 1925 show; the favourable comments on Long 'Un can not be interpreted as critical approval of Shore's 1925 painting style.

The most rapid and most radical departures from his earlier style date from the end of this period of depression. This is clearly borne out by a comparison of the 1926 reviews with the mild approbation of the Argus critic in 1925, and with the complete neglect of Shore by other reviewers up to that time.

The Age reviewer's reference to a 'puerile' study of a boy's head (Ted) in the 1926 exhibition has already been quoted in connection with establishing the date of Shore's breakdown (p 106). The critics of both the Argus and the Herald also mentioned this study, making it clear that it had not found their favour, but at the same time betraying their aversion to works which could be labelled 'modern'.

The Argus critic wrote that Ted approaches the very newest of the moderns in its treatment . . . and in this painting of a boy and one of 'Camellia' [Shore] uses an outline to emphasize his forms. This gives them an unpleasant character that is foreign to oil paint.¹

In Ted, the Herald critic believed that Shore seemed "more interested in being 'modern' than in being a painter," but he was prepared to describe as "very delightful" two flowerpieces "more readily understood by the man in the

1 Argus, September 14, 1926, p13.

street (and sometimes he can be right) than his other flower studies, Camellias and Stylosa."¹

Of the critics reviewing this exhibition in Melbourne's daily press, the only one to be granted a by-line was the Sun's Mary Allen. Mary Cecil Allen is considered, quite rightly, to have been one of Australia's foremost proponents of a more liberal outlook to art. Shore himself described her as "one of the first Australian artists, if not the first, to seek the movement at its source overseas, leaving Australia in 1927 and visiting Italy, France and London in the course of her quest."² She settled in America, and made frequent visits back to Australia, lecturing on overseas developments.

Sympathy with, and understanding of, modernist aims were not evident, however, in her review of the 1926 exhibition.

Mr Frater is responsible for some large canvases of decorative intention. Decoration in painting certainly aims at selecting out a few out of the many pictorial elements in nature, but Mr Frater has reduced them to such an extent that hardly anything remains. Decorative art does not involve untruth to natural effect, as may be seen from Chinese and Japanese designs.³

1 Herald, September 14, 1926, p4. There is some inconsistency in this review in that the 'delightful' canvases were given as Nos. 126 and 127; Stylosa, however, was exhibit No. 127 in the catalogue. The numbers quoted should probably have been 125 and 126; No. 125 was Frau Karl, named by the Argus critic as presenting "a good realistic rendering of the flowers," and No. 126 was Flowers, also labelled 'delightful' by the Sun critic in distinguishing it from Shore's more modern exhibits. Flowers is possibly the work shown in Plate 30 (see p 112, footnote 1).

2 In an obituary, Age, April 14, 1962, p20.

3 Sun, September 14, 1926.

Would she have been embarrassed to re-read those words a few years later? They exemplify the more enlightened sector of the critical climate in which Shore had to work.

The reviews of the next two years, while hardly encouraging, must at least have suggested to Shore that his more recent work was no longer being rejected out-of-hand by all critics. The Bulletin's jocular treatment of Back Yard Idyll has already been quoted (see p 119); but that review of the 1927 TMP show also described the work of Shore and Frater as 'sincere' and 'exciting'.

George Bell had replaced Mary Cecil Allen on the Sun in 1927. Although he made no mention of Shore in his review of the TMP show in that year, he acknowledged the success of two of Frater's still lifes, one of which was illustrated in the catalogue (Pl 190). Bell also assessed the modernity of the works hung on the west wall more shrewdly than had his colleagues, describing them as "modern . . . ten years ago in Paris and ultra modern in this conservative Australia."¹

By 1928, both Bell and J.S.MacDonald, writing for the Herald, were prepared to pay tribute to Shore's colour sense, and even the Argus critic, while describing the exhibits of Shore and Frater as "unintelligible to the ordinary viewer," acknowledged their "decorative qualities of colour."² The following year, however, brought staff changes to two of the dailies which arguably delayed the general public's acceptance of modernism by some years.

1 Sun, September 6, 1927, p23.

2 Argus, September 18, 1928, p11.

The two new reviewers were Blamire Young, who replaced MacDonald on the Herald, and Arthur Streeton, who accepted the position of critic for the Argus. Young had achieved a certain fashionable success with his delicate watercolours, and his name, while lacking the stature of Streeton's, was at least as familiar to the public as those of his more open-minded predecessor MacDonald, and his more progressive colleague Bell. The art critic for the Age, the fourth metropolitan daily newspaper, remained anonymous throughout the twenties and thirties. It was several years before Young could discern the virtues of Shore's vigorous technique, so far removed from his own. His only reference to the 'moderns' in the first TMP show he reviewed was: "The Bolshevik Division is amusing without being edifying."¹ In the following year, 1930, he ignored them completely.

Streeton's disparagement was more pointed.

Many canvases are hung upon the western wall of the exhibition room which appear to the spectator to be dull and quite monotonous after the many thousands of still more violent and unbeautiful pictures of the kind that have been a passing fashion in Europe for some years.

All revolutions of any kind in fine art must be revelations of new beauty.²

The layman turning for guidance and enlightenment to reviews published in the press may have been less inclined to accept Streeton's reactionary view had other critics been more kindly disposed towards the handful of artists genuinely trying to break new ground.

1 Herald, September 23, 1929, p7.

2 Argus, September 24, 1929, p9.

But, while they were less outspoken in their criticism than Streeton, his counterparts on the other newspapers remained, at best, equivocal in their attitude to modernism. Even George Bell, professing to teach modern principles of painting in his private classes, offered only the palest encouragement during the late twenties, offsetting any mildly complimentary phrase with another drawing attention to alleged shortcomings.

The reviews which greeted Shore's one-man exhibition in 1929 displayed a tolerance not evident in those of earlier TMP exhibitions. A handful of unconventional works in a group show could be dismissed or ignored more easily than could a full-scale exposition of an individual artist's convictions. Shore's one-man show, acknowledged by the Age critic as "the first of its kind in Melbourne by an Australian painter,"¹ demanded serious consideration and comment. Most reviewers, not only conscious of the established acceptance of modernism in Europe, but also, as practising artists², mindful of the exhibitor's feelings on the occasion of his first solo exhibition, were prepared to grant that consideration.

Percy Leason, in Table Talk, provided the principal exception. Attempting to be humorous, he ridiculed Shore's aims ("Only this seems certain: he desires chiefly to see things as a child sees them."³) and their results.

1 Age, August 13, 1929, p7.

2 All Melbourne reviewers whose names accompanied their articles were, at this time, recognized artists.

3 Table Talk, August 22, 1929. Shore wrote that the critics, "with one die-hard exception, were friendly rather than otherwise." (AMSA, p94) The 'exception' was presumably Leason.

The Argus accorded the exhibition only a brief paragraph which included the significant lines:

Most of the work is in a style that has been in vogue among groups overseas for a number of years. Fortunately it has had little influence on the art of Australia.¹

Both of these reviews made particular mention of the early works included in the exhibition, comparing the more recent paintings unfavourably with them.

The Age critic also remarked that the early works showed Shore to be a "capable normal painter," but was prepared to acknowledge in the more recent works "space and pattern and agreeable colour vibrations . . . brought forcibly into evidence by a drastic process of elimination."² George Bell, having written somewhat condescendingly that "some pieces fail to express anything at all," but that others "show a hint of future development," conceded that several of the flowerpieces displayed "very beautiful arrangements of colour" and "capacity in design."³

Blamire Young most clearly exemplified the duality of attitudes to group shows and one-man exhibitions. Only six weeks later he was to refer to the TMP modernists as the 'Bolshevist Division'; but his was the most encouraging review of Shore's exhibition. He criticized the "feebleness of brushwork," but found "a richness and a harmony that goes

1 Argus, August 13, 1929, p14. The writer is not identified, but the sentiments accord with those of Arthur Streeon as expressed in his later articles for the paper. This paragraph may have been considered too short to justify a by-line.

2 Age, August 13, 1929, p7.

3 Sun, August 13, 1929, p23.

some way to atone for [it]." Most importantly, he recommended all art lovers to visit the exhibition "to test their sympathy for the new movement."¹

Shore's exhibition must be seen as an important event in the history of Australian art; it can also be seen as marking a turn in the tide of anti-modernist criticism in Melbourne.² From this time, several critics adopted a more broadminded attitude to work which showed the influence of twentieth century European movements.

Arthur Streeton alone continued openly to oppose these advances. His review of the inaugural exhibition of the Contemporary Group was headed 'Retgression, Not Progress!', and criticized the "mis-shapen representations of humanity, flowers, trees and architecture."³ The following month he wrote of the 1932 TMP exhibition:

One wall is hung with 22 canvases by the so-called extremists, not one of which can properly be called a work of art.⁴

Shore had been spared Streeton's reactionary cant in the two years preceding this; the stand-in critic on the Argus had remarked upon the intellectual appeal of Shore's work, and had also written:

1 Herald, August 12, 1929.

2 The Bulletin review of the 1927 TMP exhibition was the only earlier article to express positive opinions of the work of Shore and Frater - but it was published in Sydney.

3 Argus, August 17, 1932, p8.

4 Argus, September 20, 1932, p10.

A few of the TMP artists have allowed themselves to be influenced by modern tendencies, which is not so great a sin as some people imagine.¹

- a comment which may have been aimed at Streeton as much as at the general reader.

Of the local critics, George Bell represented the position most directly opposed to Streeton's. Because of the part he had played in the formation of the Contemporary Group, Bell's opinions of its exhibitions were temperately expressed, but he could be more expansive in reviewing TMP exhibitions. In 1932, in contrast to Streeton's comments quoted on the preceding page, Bell wrote of the TMP show:

The most stimulating exhibits are to be found on the wall devoted to the modern thought in art. The more purposeful use of the aesthetic materials, form and colour, imbue the paintings with a vitality, and, therefore, an interest which is missing elsewhere.²

From 1932 (possibly to avoid any charge of favouritism) Bell paid less attention in his reviews to Shore, now his partner, than he had previously done. In 1931, however, he had mentioned the "outstanding work" shown by Shore and Frater, and had described Shore's Speaking Volumes as "a lovely piece of refined colour and composition."³

1 Argus, September 16, 1930, p11.

2 Sun, September 20, 1932, p15

3 Sun, September 15, 1931, p13. This work was also specifically mentioned by the reviewers on the other three daily newspapers - favourably in the Herald and the Argus, and in passing by the Age critic, who continued to distinguish between 'modernists' and 'normalists'.

By this time, Basil Burdett and Gino Nibbi had begun to make inroads into Melbourne's critical lethargy. Nibbi's celebrated article for the Herald in November 1931¹, though it was couched in language hardly comprehensible to a member of the public unversed in the jargon of contemporary overseas art criticism, and though it offered few constructive suggestions to practising artists, at least showed that the hallowed traditions engendered by the Australian Art Association were not sacrosanct.

Burdett had accepted a position as a senior reporter on the Herald in 1931. Although he was not to be appointed art critic until 1936, his influence was strongly felt throughout the early thirties, not least in his organization of the 1931 exhibition of modern prints held in the Herald Assembly Room.

Burdett continued to contribute articles to Art in Australia, including a brief piece on Shore in which he paid particular tribute to the artist's "distinguished sense of colour."

He uses colour instinctively with rare understanding.

Almost everything he does stimulates interest by its colour quality alone.²

The article closed with the statement that Shore's work was "as yet, unknown beyond Melbourne."

1 Nibbi, G., 'Is Australian Art Failing?', Herald, November 7, 1931, p25. The introductory paragraph states that the article was commissioned by the Herald; Burdett was probably the instigator.

2 A in A, 3:45, August 15, 1932, p22.

Four years later, in another short article for Art in Australia, Burdett could write that "no younger painter in Melbourne has grown in prestige so much in recent years as Arnold Shore."¹ By 1936, when Burdett took over as Herald art critic, Shore's battle for acceptance had been won. Even Streeton appeared to be convinced of his worth. In his review of the previous year's Contemporary Group exhibition, Streeton had described Mr Justice Evatt (Pl 78) as "splendid in its portrayal of character" (though he questioned the wisdom of the colour combinations); he had also praised the "harmony of colour, form and tone" in Shore's Flowerpiece, adding that "there is nothing more artistic in quality in the Exhibition than this delightful canvas."²

By far Shore's most enthusiastic review from this period came from the pen of his friend Lionel Lindsay, in response to the Group 12 exhibition of 1935. Lindsay wrote for the Herald while Shore was standing in for Bell on the Sun, and the two artists had developed a close friendship. Shore's work could be expected to stand out from that of his pupils in a Group 12 show held during Bell's absence, but the proportion of his review which Lindsay devoted to a eulogy of Shore's work is nevertheless surprising.

Each of Shore's three exhibits - all flowerpieces - was treated in detail. Lindsay's assessment of Strelitzia (Pl 191), purchased from the show by Mrs R.G. Casey and

1 A in A, 3:64, August 15, 1936, p63.

2 Argus, July 9, 1935, p5.

presented by her to the Hamilton Art Gallery in 1968¹, typifies the tone of the review:

In such a work, in which form is clearly understood and related through color, you have finality in paint. The first inspirational fire has never been extinguished by the hard work entailed in the painting. It remains fresh, forceful, full of character, splendid in its paint as it is notable in design.²

Other reviewers were far more restrained. Shore himself wrote the Sun review and did not mention his own work. The Age critic, still writing of 'normalist' painters, dismissed the exhibition without reference to any individual, while Edgar Holt in the Argus, though more sympathetic, could find in Strelitzia only evidence of Shore's "incurable romanticism."³

Shore's work was now seen as acceptable by even the most resolutely conservative Melbourne art critics. It has been argued in Chapter 4 that this owed as much to a wavering in Shore's development as to a more enlightened attitude to less traditional work. Some critics were still far from comfortable with anything which they were forced to label 'modern'.

1 Strelitzia (No. 49) was entitled 'Flowerpiece' in the catalogue, and marked 'Kindly Lent'. Shore's sales book records that Mrs Casey bought the painting from the show, but it is probable that she arranged its purchase before the catalogue was printed. Shore later told his wife that Maie Casey had bought several of his paintings while the paint was still wet.

2 Herald, June 24, 1935, p11.

3 Age, June 25, 1935, p7 and Argus, June 25, 1935, p7.

In 1936 Streeton was replaced on the Argus by Harold Herbert, who shared his predecessor's antipathy to modernism, but lacked his knowledge and flair. Of the Shore-Frater-Tweddle wall in the 1936 TMP exhibition, Herbert could write ingenuously: "I am not very enthusiastic about this type of art;" and he described the Group 12 show of the same year as "one of second-hand modernism striving to revive its outworn theories."¹

It was not until 1944, in reviewing the annual exhibition of the Australian Academy of Art, that he could concede:

There is a leaven of semi-modern or contemporary work which is not altogether lacking in interest - an admission hard to wring from this stone-hearted reviewer!²

Throughout this period, however, Herbert usually found something complimentary to write of Shore's work.³

The Age critic maintained his anonymity throughout the thirties and forties - although the consistently mannered expression of the majority of Age reviews from 1930 until the end of the war marks them as the work of one writer. His nameless image was matched with characterless, inoffensive comment which did little more than acknowledge the existence of alternative styles of expression. It was left to the two organs of the Murdoch publishing empire, the Herald and the Sun to provide readers of Melbourne's daily press with critical comment which was responsive to the forces of

1 These two reviews appeared in the Argus of September 22, 1936, p8, and June 17, 1936, p8.

2 Argus, July 11, 1944, p6.

3 On several occasions he described Shore's work as 'decorative', which may not have been taken, but was clearly intended, as favourable comment.

artistic progress which escalated from the mid-thirties.

George Bell, relieved occasionally by Adrian Lawlor, ensured that the issues raised by artists associated with the Contemporary Art Society received due and sympathetic attention. His falling out with Shore, however, precluded his making more than passing comment on any work exhibited by his former partner in a group show. Shore received far more favourable treatment in the Herald, at first from Burdett then, during the war, from Norman MacGeorge and Kenneth Wilkinson, both of whom were staunch advocates of experimentation and progress.

Shore's solo exhibitions in 1938 and 1940 drew more expansive comment from local critics, but the preferences and attitudes revealed were no different. Bell managed to qualify much of his praise for Shore's vitality by choosing adjectives with derogatory connotations - 'violent', 'clamant', 'unrestful', 'aggressive'.¹ The Age critic betrayed his inability to come to terms with contemporary issues in remarking that, in his flowerpieces and still lifes, "the artist appears to be more concerned with pattern and the correlation of colour values than with literal representation."²

Harold Herbert, having acknowledged Shore's "full-blooded colour sense," complained that, in some flowerpieces,

Mr Shore overtaxes his colour range, and splodges of pure colour lack cohesion and quality. The almost complete

1 Sun, August 16, 1938, p21, and August 7, 1940, p10.

2 Age, August 16, 1938, p14.

disregard of values of tone renders these efforts into something resembling a section of carpet bearing a floral pattern.¹

It was again left to Basil Burdett to make a sympathetic assessment. He was generous with his praise of both shows, with the qualification that Shore at times showed a tendency "to live too much on his emotions" and to allow the exuberance of his colour to run away with him.²

The title chosen by Burdett for his 1938 review - 'Mr Shore, A Realist Who Can Excite Us' - is significant. It suggests that, only a month after the formation of the Contemporary Art Society, Shore, by now an exhibiting member of the Academy, was no longer seen by Burdett as one of Melbourne's more progressive artists. In their reviews of the 1940 exhibition, Burdett, Bell and the Age critic all chose to describe Shore's approach as basically impressionistic, a term which emphasized the different paths taken by Shore and by the leaders of Melbourne's new avant garde.

One point on which all reviewers agreed was that Shore's most impressive pieces were to be found among the bush landscapes, first shown in the 1938 one-man exhibition. In 1940 Burdett wrote:

Mr Shore brings to landscape the same fresh vigor of attack, the same breadth and freedom, which have always given his flowerpieces so distinctive and individual a quality.³

1 Argus, August 16, 1938, p14.

2 Herald, August 15, 1938, p10.

3 Herald, August 6, 1940, p10.

Having expounded at length on the virtues of the landscapes, Burdett added that with two exceptions the flowerpieces shown were "less interesting than on previous occasions." Although no flowerpiece from the show can now be positively identified, the two studies of Dahlias illustrated in Plates 101 and 102, with their less textural surfaces and more formal compositions, typify the flowerpieces of the early war years, and justify Burdett's reservations. The public agreed: all nine sales were of landscapes.

Shore's critical reception in Sydney ran closely parallel to that accorded him by Melbourne's more progressive commentators. He first exhibited in Sydney in 1933 with the Contemporary Group, and was elected to the Society of Artists in 1936. He regularly sent entries to the annual exhibitions of both societies until the end of the war.

Prior to his first one-man exhibition at the Macquarie Galleries in 1937, Shore received little attention from the Sydney press. The reviewer for the Sydney Morning Herald - the only Sydney daily consistently covering art exhibitions - was, however, sympathetic to the aims of the Contemporary Group, writing on the occasion of the 1933 exhibition: "the time seems opportune to appeal to the public for a careful and sympathetic examination of the work."¹ He made no mention of Shore in his assessment of individual exhibitors, but the following year included his name in a long list of artists contributing "excellent work."²

1 SMH, October 25, 1933, p8.

2 SMH, August 14, 1934, p6.

By 1936 (the year in which Burdett began to eulogize Shore's work in Melbourne) the SMH reviewer could acknowledge that Shore's Autumn "differs completely in style from anything that is being done in Sydney."¹ As in Melbourne, 1937 represented the peak of Shore's critical success in Sydney. Despite describing the 1937 one-man show as "uneven in its achievement,"² the SMH reviewer was particularly complimentary of Gold and Silver and Banksias (both of which were destined for public collections), and a few months later devoted a generous proportion of his review of the Contemporary Group exhibition to an enthusiastic evaluation of Shore's exhibits.³

In 1938 Shore contributed to neither the Contemporary Group nor the Society of Artists exhibition, no doubt concentrating on his own one-man show in Melbourne, which fell between them. From that time, although an occasional exhibit of Shore's drew favourable comment⁴, critical interest in contemporary work swung, as in Melbourne, towards the exhibitions of the Contemporary Art Society. Shore faded from the critical spotlight in both capitals.

The SMH review of his 1941 exhibition at the Macquarie Galleries was headed 'Less Vigor, Less Color'⁵, and was less

1 SMH, July 18, 1936, p14; review of Contemporary Group exhibition.

2 SMH, March 31, 1937, p10.

3 SMH, July 15, 1937, p5.

4 Hot Days in SMH, June 22, 1939, p13; Still Life (now in the AGNSW) in SMH, July 30, 1940, p4 (both in Contemporary Group shows); and The Park (AGNSW) in SMH, September 4, 1941, p6 (Society of Artists).

5 SMH, February 19, 1941, p7.

than enthusiastic about the change that had taken place in Shore's style since his previous show four years earlier. Criticism was levelled at his "more timid approach" which had produced works lacking "the intensity of color and strong formal design of much of his earlier work."

During the war years in Melbourne, in newspapers of restricted size, exhibitions were often reviewed only cursorily. Shore continued to exhibit with the Twenty Melbourne Painters and the Australian Academy, but rarely rated more than a passing mention in reviews. His own one-man show at Georges Gallery in May 1945 brought a single non-committal paragraph in the Argus and nothing in the other dailies.

By the time of Shore's 1946 one-man exhibition, also at Georges Gallery, Melbourne's critical climate had become as tolerant of progressive art as Sydney's. The exhibition was reviewed, briefly but favourably, by George Bell in the Sun, Adrian Lawlor in the Herald and Alan McCulloch in the Argus.¹ Lawlor described it as "Mr Shore's best show to date," but Shore, recently appointed to the Council of the Academy, was now treated as an establishment figure whose further experiments were of less interest than those of younger, more aggressively adventurous artists.

1926 was the year in which Shore's 'modernity' was first seized upon by the Melbourne critics, quick to cut down any artist who dared to question the traditional verities of academic realism. In the space of twenty years the image

¹ Sun, June 19, 1946, p19; Herald, June 18, 1946, p8; Argus, June 19, 1946, p12. The Age did not review the exhibition.

of Shore presented by reviewers passed from incomprehensible radical to conventional Academician. The paths of progress followed separately by Shore and by his critics met briefly in the thirties, as he tasted the pleasures of popular success. But art criticism in Melbourne had been retarded for so long that when it was finally released from its torpor in the early thirties, no individual artist's development could have kept pace with it. Complicating the course of its advance was a number of incorrigibly reactionary critics who survived through to the forties. That for a time Shore could produce work which earned the plaudits of all these factions simultaneously was in itself a remarkable achievement.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of the rapidity of the change in critical outlook was that, in the newly aroused enthusiasm for the current avant garde, no place could be found for those few artists who had fought the early battles for recognition of alternative styles. The innovators of an earlier generation (and others not innovative at all) had been recognized early and had enjoyed public favour throughout their waning careers. Shore's period of public success had been tantalizingly brief.

The first public acknowledgement of the extent of his originality - not only in a pioneering capacity, incorporating twentieth century European developments into his paintings of the twenties, but also in his continued experimentation with the bushscapes of the war years - did not come until 1957, with the organization of his retrospective exhibition

at the Australian Galleries.¹ Shore could spend his last years content in the knowledge that his contribution to Australian art had belatedly been recognized.

1 Extracts from the reviews by Alan McCulloch and John Brack have been quoted on pp 275-6.

CONCLUSION

The three stated aims of this thesis were to establish Arnold Shore's importance as a pioneer modernist, to assess his contribution to Australian art in a broader context, and to trace the development of his painting from the first world war until his death nearly fifty years later. Clearly the three aims are closely inter-related.

Shore was an unlikely innovator. Throughout his life he demonstrated that he was of neither a rebellious nor an adventurous nature. He accepted his mother's domination well into adulthood, and the responsibilities entailed in caring for her in her old age. He held his first job for nearly twenty years, and may have remained at Brooks Robinson indefinitely had the depression not forced him out. In later life he continued to work as both guide-lecturer and art critic after the duties had become tiresome. As a student, he persevered for five years in the National Gallery drawing class, and followed this with another five under Meldrum, despite increasing dissatisfaction in both instances.

This apparent resistance to change, this reluctance to take risks with his personal life, did not spill over into his painting. Introduced by way of a few small monotone reproductions in Orpen's Outline of Art to ideas which forced him to question his previous assumptions about art, Shore embraced the new concepts whole-heartedly.

Shore battled the hostility of reactionary Melbourne critics to win acceptance both for his own work and,

implicitly, for the principles of twentieth century European art as he understood them. In this he was supported almost alone by his friend William Frater. Shore's enthusiasm had persuaded Frater to review his opinions of artists and styles to which he had already been introduced, but which had not previously influenced him significantly.

Several factors limited Shore's success. Melbourne's newspaper critics, in almost all instances, were successful artists practising in the decaying post-Heidelberg tradition, who had little knowledge of, and less sympathy for, recent European developments. Australia was riding on a wave of national pride, built up since the last years of the nineteenth century, and fostered by still-vivid memories of the Great War. Part of this ethos was a belief in the decadence of European society, culture and art.

It is understandable that Australians, in their relatively stable and comfortable circumstances, could not appreciate art that had been spawned in the highly volatile political and social environment of early twentieth century Europe. Shore himself, drawing his knowledge almost solely from reproductions and the inadequate commentaries accompanying them, was unable to grasp much of the underlying theory. His experiments, consequently, lacked a clear direction, and his output throughout the twenties and early thirties was eclectic and inconsistent.

His work of this time, however, displays characteristics which set it apart from that of his contemporaries. Although he drew on a variety of sources for his inspiration,

he selectively concentrated on aspects which complemented his strengths. Shore could never accept the violent colour distortions of the fauves, but their freedom with colour helped to release him from the strictures of his training under Meldrum. Horace Brandt further encouraged him to exploit his natural colour sense and his predilection for vigorous technique. This was reinforced by the work of Van Gogh, Soutine and Vlaminck, especially as revealed in the quality reproductions available from about 1930.

After Meldrum, Brandt must be seen as the local artist most influential on Shore's development. Other Australian artist affected him very little. Contemporary art in Sydney and Melbourne developed virtually independently. Work done in Sydney prior to 1920 by Wakelin and de Maistre could have influenced Shore had he been exposed to it, but the insularity of Meldrum's group, combined with the conservative policies of Art in Australia, the principal vehicle for the dissemination of artistic information throughout Australia, ensured that he was not. By the time Margaret Preston's work was brought to his attention, she had moved beyond his comprehension, however tentatively, into the fields of cubism and abstraction.

Nor did Shore's work directly influence many other artists at that time. Even at the Bell-Shore school he had no close followers among those who went on to achieve independent recognition; Bell's influence was far more pervasive.

Where, then, does Shore's importance as a pioneer modernist lie? He, more than any other Melbourne artist, was instrumental in forcing local critics to discuss modern art, even if only in derogatory terms. By continually exhibiting paintings which challenged prevailing conservative tastes, he forced the issue of modern art into the open. Critical attitudes to modernism changed significantly, if not radically, between 1925 and 1931. The numbers who attended Burdett's exhibition of modern prints in late 1931 showed that public interest had also been aroused.

How much, if any, of this change can be attributed to Shore's persistence, and how much to an historically inevitable mellowing of the attitudes of both critics and public, is impossible to say. Burdett and Nibbi contributed more than any practising artist to the acceptance of modernism in Melbourne, but Shore provided them with a local artist whose work could be cited and championed in the course of their campaign.

Any attempt to explain Shore's importance solely in terms of his role as a pioneer modernist must be unconvincing, because his painting was not modern in any but a comparative, strictly local sense. It was many years behind developments in Europe, and even in Sydney. Shore was a purveyor of imperfectly understood second-hand European ideas, most of which reached him screened through the selection process of partially sympathetic British editors, and diluted by mediocre reproductions.

Through the early and middle thirties, the brilliant colour and rich impastos of his flowerpieces increasingly

attracted the acclaim of public and critics who recognized in them a vitality unmatched by any other Australian artist. Shore was beginning to develop a recognizable and individualistic style, but these flower studies still abound with references to a variety of earlier European artists.

It was not until he began to paint the bush around Macedon that Shore's true originality fully emerged. He discerned the movement and colour inherent in a clump of dense bush, and recognized that it could convincingly be conveyed through the direct application of thick pigment to the canvas, and the juxtaposition of unlikely colour combinations.

That he believed he had found his *métier* is made clear by the rarity of his subsequent ventures outside landscape. The works of his last years demonstrate his ability to return repeatedly to scenes another artist would have found uninspiring, and to create from them vibrant tapestries of endless variety.

His vigorous and exuberant approach to these landscapes owes a direct debt to Matthew Smith, but compared with Smith's swirling, abandoned brushstrokes and simple forms, Shore's bushscapes are built up as a network of precise and intricately interwoven lines and patches which accurately evoke the distinctive character of the Australian bush - its movement, its impenetrability, and its implicitly infinite extent.

No artist setting out to portray the Australian bush could now free himself completely from Shore's influence. Nolan's multi-panelled river scenes from the mid-sixties, and many of the landscapes of John Perceval and Fred Williams bear eloquent testimony to the pervasiveness of Shore's vision. The current stature of the artists most influenced by Shore attests to his insight; that this influence did not emerge in their work until long after he had developed his mature style is a measure of his originality.

Shore's contribution to Australian art is not limited to the paintings he has left; it constitutes a vital part of the Australian landscape tradition on which generations of future artists will draw.

There are no
pages 319 - 324

CATALOGUE OF WORKS BY SHORE

Catalogue entries have been arranged chronologically by year of execution. Following the individual entries painted in, or assigned to, a particular year, is a list of additional works exhibited in that year, but about which nothing further is known. These additional works are grouped by the exhibition in which they appeared; a work exhibited more than once is listed only under the exhibition in which it first appeared. Purchasers, where they appear on these lists, have in most cases been taken from Shore's Sales book. Descriptions such as "destroyed", "scrapped", or "lost" have been taken from Shore's annotated copies of the exhibition catalogues.

All measurements are given in centimetres, height preceding width.

Abbreviations used in the Catalogue:

Acad.	Australian Academy of Art exhibitions.
AGNSW	Art Gallery of New South Wales.
AGR	Australian Galleries Retrospective Exhibition, 1957.
ANG	Australian National Gallery, Canberra.
Ath.	Athenaeum Gallery one-man exhibitions.
CAG	Castlemaine Art Gallery, Shore exhibition 1973.
CG(M)	Contemporary Group (Melbourne) exhibitions.
CG(S)	Contemporary Group (Sydney) exhibitions.
EMGB	Eagle and Minchin, <u>George Bell: Students, Friends, Influences</u> , Deutscher, Melbourne, 1981.
FYSF	<u>Forty Years Seek and Find.</u>
Georges	Georges Gallery one-man exhibitions.
HCAG	Hawthorn City Art Gallery, Shore exhibition 1969.
Macq.	Macquarie Galleries one-man exhibitions.
MBC	Melbourne Book Club Gallery one-man exhibition.
MGB	Moreton Galleries, Brisbane, one-man exhibition.
NGV	National Gallery of Victoria.
PSG	Powell Street Gallery one-man exhibition, 'The Later Work of Arnold Shore'.
SB	Shore's Sales book.
SSA	(Sydney) Society of Artists exhibitions.
TMP	Twenty Melbourne Painters exhibitions.
VAS	Victorian Artists' Society exhibitions.
Vel.	Velasquez Gallery one-man exhibition.

- 1 (PRINCE'S BRIDGE)
c.1915
Oil on cardboard, c.21.5 x 26
Unsigned
Prov: Alice Owen (Shore's sister).
Coll: Private collection, Hobart.
- 2 (TREES AND VISTA)
c.1915
Oil on cardboard, c.26 x 20.5
Unsigned
Prov: Alice Owen.
Coll: Private collection, Hobart.
- 3 STILL LIFE (JUG AND JAR)
c.1915
Oil on cardboard, c.21.5 x 26
Unsigned
Prov: Alice Owen.
Coll: Private collection, Hobart.

Victorian Artists' Society Annual Exhibition, 1917:

- 4 A SKETCH, No. 16, no price given.
- 5 THE OLD FORGE, No. 158, 10gns.
- 6 STILL LIFE, No. 160, no price given.
- 7 EVENING, BURNLEY, No. 216, 3gns.

The Sales book (written up at least fourteen years after this exhibition) records two sales: a watercolour sketch 'Burnley Quarries' to J.M.McNally [sic] for 5 guineas, and a still life 'Roses' to W.H.Gill Fine Art Society for 6 guineas. The second of these would appear to be Cat. no. 6; the first could be either Cat. no. 4 or Cat. no. 7, wrongly priced.

Victorian Artists' Society Spring Exhibition, 1917:

- 8 ROSES, No. 22, 3gns.
- 9 PORT MELBOURNE, No. 38, 10gns.
- 10 A SKETCH, HEIDELBERG, No. 69, 15gns.

- 11 MANDARINS
c.1918
Oil on canvas, 13 x 15.1
Insc: Shore, lr
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 2.
Prov: Purchased by A.K.Henderson from a Meldrum Students' exhibition.
Purchased by current owner, Joel's 1957.
Coll: Private collection, London.

Victorian Artists' Society Annual Exhibition, 1918:

- 12 INTERIOR, No. 25, 10gns.
- 13 THE BRASS TRAY, No. 32, 5gns.

VAS (Annual) 1918, cont.

- 14 CHRYSANTHEMUMS, No. 51, 30gns.
 15 SELF PORTRAIT, No. 155, 25gns.
 16 SHELLS, No. 156, 4gns.

Victorian Artists' Society Spring Exhibition, 1918:

- 17 ARUM LILY, No. 20, 7gns.
 18 STILL LIFE, No. 38, 15gns.

Meldrum Students' Exhibitions, 1919 and 1920:

Shore exhibited, but the works were given no titles.
 Catalogue numbers will not be assigned.

- 19 BLUE HYDRANGEAS
 1921
 Oil on canvas laid down on hardboard, 60.8 x 49.2
 Insc: Shore, ll.
 Exh: Meldrum Students' Exhibition, 1921.
 Prov: Purchased by Miss Rowe from Meldrum Students'
 Exhibition, 1921.
 Acquired by current owner 1973.
 Coll: Art Gallery of Western Australia.

Meldrum Group Exhibition, 1921:

- 20 A BOWL OF ROSES
 21 BOWL OF GRAPES
 22 RANUNCULI
 1922
 Oil on cardboard, 38.2 x 29.3
 Insc: Shore 22, lr.
 Prov: Alice Owen.
 Coll: Private collection, Hobart.
 23 CARNATIONS AND IRISES
 c.1922
 Oil on panel, 41.5 x 31.5
 Insc: Shore, ll.
 Verso: Dear Ide, The surface of this sketch is
 waxed and if it goes dull just give it a
 mild rub with a cloth & it will be right.
 Love from Arn.
 Prov: Ida Patterson (Shore's sister).
 Coll: Private collection, Sydney.
 24 STUDY OF A CHINESE FIGURE
 1923 (January)
 Oil on canvas, 61.2 x 51.2
 Insc: Verso: Arnold Shore (otherwise unsigned).
 Ill: Exhibition of Australian Art in London, 1923,
 (catalogue of Burlington House exhibition), Pl 140.
 Exh: Burlington House, London, 1923.
 TMP 1924, No. 119, 10gns.
 Ath. 1929, No. 13, 10gns.
 AGR 1957, No. 3.

- 25 SELF PORTRAIT
c.1922-3
Oil on cardboard, 30.5 x 22.8
Unsigned
Exh: TMP 1923, No. 126, 50gns.(?)
AGR 1957, No. 1 (dated 1917-18).
Prov: Purchased by Polly Hurry (Mrs John Farmer) from
TMP 1923 (or possibly from an earlier Meldrum
Students' show).
John Farmer.
Coll: Castlemaine Art Gallery.
- 26 SELF PORTRAIT
1923
Oil
Ill: TMP 1923 catalogue.
Exh: TMP 1923, No. 125, NFS.
Lost.
- Twenty Melbourne Painters, August 1923:
- 27 AUTUMN OAK LEAVES, No. 127, 30gns.
28 LACQUER BASKET AND ORANGES, No. 128, 15gns.
29 PEACHES AND PEARS, No. 129, 25gns.
30 CHRYSANTHEMUMS, No. 130, 20gns.
- 31 IRISES IN A BROWN JAR
1924
Oil on canvas laid down on board, 40 x 35
Insc: Shore 24, ur.
Prov: Joel's, May 1980, lot 470A, withdrawn from sale.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- Twenty Melbourne Painters, November 1924:
- 32 PORTRAIT, No. 117, NFS.
33 AUTUMN LEAVES, No. 118, 20gns.
34 FLOWERS AND LEAVES, No. 120, 15gns.
35 LUPINS, No. 121, 15gns.
36 CHRYSANTHEMUMS, No. 122, 15gns.
37 LILAC, No. 123, 8gns.
- Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1925:
- 38 SKETCH PORTRAIT, No. 121, NFS.
39 A CHEERFUL SPIRIT, No. 122, 30gns.
40 LONG 'UN, No. 123, 15gns.
Also Ath. 1929, No. 23, NFS.
41 ROSES, No. 124, 10gns.
42 SKETCH OF A CHINESE FIGURE, No. 125, 3gns.
43 ICELAND POPPIES, No. 126, 5gns.
44 STILL LIFE, No. 127, 10gns.

- 45 CAMELLIAS
1926 (?)
Oil on canvas
Insc: A Shore, 1l.
Ill: TMP 1926 catalogue.
Exh: TMP 1926, No. 123, 10gns.
Prov: Purchased by Adrian Lawlor, December 1926, £5.
Ref: Letter, Lawlor to Shore, December 1926 (Shore's
correspondence files).
Destroyed in Warrandyte bushfires, 1939.
- 46 (CARNATIONS)
1926
Oil on canvas, 56.6 x 46.1
Insc: Shore 1926, 1r.
Verso (on canvas on stretcher): Flowers Shore 1926.
Ill: Joel's November 1981 catalogue, p56.
Exh: TMP 1926 (as 'Flowers'), No. 126, 10gns. (?)
Prov: A.M.E.Bale; possibly purchased from TMP 1926.
Joel's, November 1981, lot 252 as 'Still Life';
sold \$2000.
Coll: Private collection.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1926:

- 47 TED, No. 121, NFS.
- 48 STILL LIFE, No. 122, 10gns.
- 49 SPRING TIME, No. 124, 10gns.
- 50 FRAU KARL, No. 125, 15gns.
- 51 STYLOSA, No. 127, 5gns.
- 52 MARIGOLDS
(c.1926-8)
Oil on canvas, 60 x 50.3
Insc: Shore, 1r.
Prov: In current owner's family (that of Shore's sister
Ida) in Tasmania before family moved to Sydney in
1929.
Coll: Private collection, Sydney.
- 53 FLOWERS (DAISIES)
c.1927
Oil
Ill: TMP 1927 catalogue.
Exh: TMP 1927, No. 133, 15gns.
Lost.
- 54 BACK YARD IDYLL
1927
Oil on canvas
Insc: S, 1r.
Ill: FYSF.
EMGB, p32.
Exh: TMP 1927, No. 131, 20gns.
Ath. 1929, No. 2, (as 'The Parrot'), 20gns. (?)
Ref: Bulletin, September 15, 1927, p52.
Destroyed by Shore, early thirties.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1927:

- 55 BEAUMARIS, No. 132, 30gns.
 56 STILL LIFE, No. 134, 8gns.
 57 ZINNIAS, No. 135, 8gns.
 58 HEAVY BLOOMS, No. 136, 10gns.
 59 LEAVES AND FLOWERS, No. 137, 8gns.
- 60 RED CAMELLIAS
 1928
 Oil on canvas, 41.4 x 51.1
 Insc: A Shore 28, cl.
 Verso: Red Camellias Arnold Shore 1928
 Exh: TMP 1928, No. 119, 8gns.
 Prov: Mrs D. Levigny, Castlemaine.
 Coll: Castlemaine Art Gallery.
- 61 THE VERANDAH
 1928
 Coloured pencil, 22.5 x 31.7
 Unsigned
 Exh: Ath. 1929, No. 44, 4gns. (?)
 Georges Gallery, George Bell Exhibition, 1981, No. 160.
 Ill: EMGB, p258.
 Prov: George Bell.
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 62 LANDSCAPE SKETCH
 1928
 Pastel
 Exh: AGR 1957, No. 6.
 Prov: Miss Mary Plante.
 Whereabouts unknown.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1928:

- 63 GAILLIARD, No. 116, 15gns.
 64 CAMELLIAS, No. 117, 8gns.
 65 THE LETTER RACK, No. 118, 5gns.
 Also Ath. 1929, No. 19, 6gns.
 66 STYLOSA, No. 120, 5gns.; given to Jo Sweatman (SB).
 67 LILY LEAVES, No. 121, 20gns.
 68 POPPIES, No. 122, 20gns.
- 69 THE CIRCUS
 1929
 Oil on canvas on composite board, 60.8 x 60.8
 Insc: Shore 29, 1r
 Ill: EMGB, p259.
 Exh: TMP 1929, No. 111, 25gns. (?)
 AGR 1957, No. 5.
 HCAG 1969, No. 1.
 CAG 1973, No. 1.
 Prov: Given by Shore to Ada Plante; returned to him on
 her death. Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, 1980.
 Coll: NGV.

- 70 RHODODENDRONS
1929
Oil on canvas, 51.6 x 41.4
Insc: Shore 29, lr.
Ill: Joel's November 1981 catalogue, p188.
Exh: Ath. 1929, No. 15, 6gns. (?)
Prov: A.M.E.Bale; probably purchased from Ath. 1929.
Joel's, November 1981, lot 1200, as 'Still Life';
sold \$2800.
Coll: Private collection.
- 71 (BOWL OF CAMELLIAS)
1929
Oil on cloth laid down on board, 41.5 x 51.4
Insc: Shore 29, ur.
Prov: Isabel Tweddle.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 72 UNION STREET, WINDSOR
1929
Oil on canvas, 38.9 x 44.2
Insc: Shore 29, lr.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 7.
Prov: Bill Oliver.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

Athenaeum Gallery one-man exhibition, August 1929.

- 73 A COUNTRY ROAD, No. 1, 50gns.
74 IN THE GARDEN, No. 3, 20gns.
75 BATHERS, No. 4, 15gns.
76 THE TANGERINE VENDOR, No. 5, 15gns.
77 EMMAEUS, No. 6, 20gns.
78 FANTASIA, No. 7, 10gns.
79 THE FISH STALL, No. 8, 10gns.
80 IMPRESSIONS OF A CIRCUS, No. 9, 20gns.
81 THE RIDER, No. 10, 10gns.
82 INDIAN AZALEAS, No. 11, 10gns.
83 FLOWERS, No. 14, 10gns.
84 AUTUMN EVENING, No. 16, 10gns.
85 COLOR MEDLEY, No. 17, 15gns.
86 CAMELLIAS, No. 18, 6gns.
87 STILL LIFE, No. 20, 5gns.
88 ROSES, No. 21, 5gns.
89 FLOWERS AND FAN, No. 22, 15gns.
90 THE VILLAGE, No. 25, 3gns.
91 THE NEW ROAD, No. 26, 4gns.
92 INTERIOR, No. 27, 3gns.
93 BUSH FANTASY, No. 28, 3gns.

Athenaeum Gallery, 1929, cont.

- 94 THE OLD CHIMNEY, No. 29, 3gns.
- 95 TREES AND HILLS, No. 30, 4gns.
- 96 KANGAROO COTTAGE, No. 31, 3gns.
- 97 SUNRISE, No. 32, 4gns.
- 98 WARRANDYTE, No. 33, 3gns.
- 99 THE COUNTRY TOWN, No. 34, 4gns.
- 100 WILLOWS, No. 35, 3gns.
- 101 TREE PATTERNS, No. 36, 3gns.
- 102 NOON, No. 37, 3gns.
- 103 JONES' STORE, No. 38, 4gns.
- 104 RAIN, No. 39, 4gns.
- 105 THE HOTEL, No. 40, 3gns.
- 106 THE HILL, No. 41, 3gns.
- 107 UPWEY, No. 42, 3gns.
- 108 THE RED COTTAGE, No. 43, 3gns.
- 109 EVENING, WARRANDYTE, No. 45, 4gns.
- 110 THE WHITE COTTAGE, No. 46, 4gns.
- 111 FISH, No. 47, 4gns.; purchased by Mrs Hartrick (SB).
- 112 EARLY MORNING, WARRANDYTE, No. 48, 3gns.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1929:

- 113 RALEIGH STREET, No. 110, 30gns.
- 114 SPRING FLOWERS, No. 112, 15gns.
- 115 FLOWERS, No. 113, 10gns.
- 116 GAMELLIAS, No. 114, 6gns.
- 117 LANDSCAPE, No. 114A, 10gns.
- 118 RANUNCULUS
1930
Oil on canvas, 45.7 x 41.2
Insc: Shore 1930, lr.
Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, Autumn 1974.
Exh: Autumn Salon, Paris, 1930.
TMP 1931, No. 101, 15gns.
Prov: Purchased by Daryl Lindsay from TMP 1931.
Joseph Brown, Autumn 1974.
Coll: Private collection.
- 119 PENLEIGH BOYD'S STUDIO
1930
Oil on board, 35.2 x 45
Insc: Verso: Penleigh Boyd's Studio 1930 Arnold Shore.
Prov: Purchased by Isabel Tweddle from Shore for
2 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

- 120 THE SPEECH
 1930
 Pencil, 26.2 x 20.4
 Insc: Shore 1930, lr.
 Verso: Memory drawing of Frater making a speech
 to the guests at a Party given by Mr and
 Mrs Newmark at Alphington (or Fairfield
 Park) 1930. Audience Bolshies,
 Intelligensia & Wealthy Jews.
 Exh: VAS Drawings and Watercolours Exhibition, July
 1953, No. 12.
 AGR 1957, No. 9.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1930:

- 121 PETROUSCHKA, No. 112, 20gns.
 122 RIGHT AHEAD - IN FRONT OF YOU, No. 113, 20gns.
 123 THE RUBBITTY, No. 114, 20gns.
 124 SUGGESTION, No. 115, 10gns.
 125 TREE-LIFE, No. 116, 10gns.
 126 BURNT BLACK, No. 117, 20gns.
 127 LILAC-TIME, No. 118, 10gns.
 128 MORNING GLORIES (CONVOLVULUS)
 1931
 Oil on canvas, 50 x 60.5
 Insc: Shore 31, lr.
 Exh: CAG 1973, No. 3.
 Prov: Given by Shore to Mrs D. Levigny, 1931 (SB).
 Presented to current owner 1981.
 Coll: Castlemaine Art Gallery.
 129 CANNAS
 1931
 Oil, c.60 x 50
 Insc: Shore 31, lr.
 Ill: Art in Australia, August 1932, p22.
 Exh: TMP 1931, No. 106, 10gns.
 Prov: Given by Shore to Basil Burdett, 1931 (SB).
 Whereabouts unknown.
 130 STILL LIFE
 1931
 Oil on canvas laid down on board, 59 x 49
 Insc: Shore '31, ll.
 Prov: Joel's, May 1978, lot 402; sold \$1700.
 Whereabouts unknown.
 131 STILL LIFE WITH LILIES
 1931
 Oil on canvas laid down on board, 66.4 x 47.2
 Insc: Shore 31, lr.
 Coll: Ballarat Fine Art Gallery.

- 132 METAMORPHOSES
1931
Oil on canvas, 50 x 60
Insc: Shore 31, lr.
Exh: TMP 1931, No. 102, 10gns.
Prov: Purchased by Aaron Newmark from TMP 1931 (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 133 REHEARSAL: RAVEL'S BOLERO
1931
Oil on canvas on composite board, 54.6 x 67.3
Insc: S, lc.
Ill: EMGB, p34 (b&w) and p69 (c).
Exh: TMP 1931, No. 105 (as 'Fantasy: The Ravel Bolero'),
30gns.
AGR 1957, No. 10.
Prov: Sold by Shore to current owner, 1962.
Ref: Shore file, AGNSW Library.
Coll: AGNSW.
- 134 SKETCH OF BELLADONNA LILIES
c.1931
Prov: Sold by Shore to Harry Mitchell, 1931, for
1 guinea (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 135 BELLA DONNA
1931 (November-December)
Oil on canvas on hardboard, 76.5 x 64.2
Insc: Shore 31, lr.
Ill: 'Looking Back', NGV catalogue, 1975.
EMGB, p37.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 11.
'Looking Back', NGV travelling exhibition, 1975.
CAG 1973, No. 2.
Prov: Sold by Shore to current owner, 1957.
Coll: NGV.
- Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1931:
- 136 ACROSS THE STREET, No. 100, 30gns.
137 TOUR DE FORCE, No. 103, 20gns,
138 SPEAKING VOLUMES, No. 104, 20gns.
- 139 TULIPS
1932
Oil on canvas
Insc: Shore 32, lr.
Coll: Private collection, England.
- 140 ROSES
1932
Oil on canvas, 51.5 x 46.6
Insc: Shore 32, ll.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

- 141 FLOWERS (MIXED BUNCH)
 c.1932
 Oil, c.75 x 62
 Exh: CG(M) 1932, No. 51, 20gns.
 Prov: Purchased from CG(M) 1932 by Mrs R.G.Casey
 for 15 guineas (SB).
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 142 CACTI
 c.1932
 Oil, c.40 x 40
 Prov: Purchased by Dr Clive Stephen as a present for
 Dr Fay McClure, 1932, 6 guineas (SB).
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 143 FLOWER STUDY (CANNAS)
 1932
 Oil on board, 68 x 55
 Insc: Shore 32.
 Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, Spring 1974.
 Thomas, D., Outlines of Australian Art, p180.
 Exh: NGV, 'The Joseph Brown Collection', 1981.
 Coll: Joseph Brown, Melbourne.
- 144 AUTUMN FLOWERS
 (c.1932)
 Oil on panel, 61.7 x 51.9
 Unsigned.
 Exh: Macq. 1937, No. 12, 30gns. (?)
 Coll: Private collection, Sydney.
- 145 PORTRAIT OF NANCY GOLLIN
 c.1932
 Prov: Given by Shore to Miss Gollin, 1932 (SB).
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 146 TOMATOES
 c.1932
 Oil
 Prov: Given by Shore to Dr Clive Stephen, 1932 (SB).
- 147 THE CLASS AT WORK
 1932
 Oil
 Insc: Shore 32, 1r.
 Ill: Art in Australia, December 1933.
 EMGB, p34.
 Ref: Shore's scrapbook contains a photograph of this
 work, under which is written: "Class at work in
 school studio. Painted from a photograph.
 L to R Nancy Gollin, Kath Lee Neil, Margaret Syme,
 Louise Thomas, Chrisma Wahlers."
 Lost.
- Contemporary Group (Melbourne), August 1932:
- 148 GARDEN, No. 47, 15gns.
 149 GIRL, No. 48, NFS.
 150 NUDE, No.49, 30gns.
 151 CITY, No. 50, 10gns.
 152 CANNAS, No. 52, 15gns.; given to Sir James Barrett (SB).

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1932:

- 153 NUDE
- 154 RAMBLERS
- 155 TRIO
- 156 GIRL
- 157 HAKEA, Oil; given to Kath Lee Neil (Mrs Brian Jones)
as a wedding present, 1932 (SB).
- 158 FLOWERS
- 159 PORTRAIT OF LADY BARRETT
1933
Oil on board, 60 x 50
Insc: Shore 33, lr.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 160 LADY BARRETT
1933-4
Oil
Ill: Unidentified newspaper; cutting in Shore's
scrapbook.
Exh: 1934 Archibald Prize Exhibition, National Art
Gallery of N.S.W., January, 1935, No. 2.
Lost.
- 161 LILIES
1933
Oil, c.52 x 65
Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 2.
Prov: Lady Casey.
Coll: Private collection, Sydney (?).
- 162 GLADIOLI
c.1933
Oil
Prov: Sold by Shore to C.Way, 1933, for 2 guineas.
Returned to Shore; resold to Connie Smith, for
3 guineas (SB).
Destroyed in Warrandyte bushfires, 1939.
- 163 BOURKE STREET ROOF TOPS
c.1933
Oil
Prov: Sold by Shore to Basil Burdett, 1933, for 2
guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 164 PEONIES
1933
Oil on canvas, 47 x 41.5
Insc: Shore '33, lr.
Ill: Joel's July 1982 catalogue, p187.
Prov: Given by Shore to Daisy Ashley, 1933 (SB).
Joel's, July 1982, lot 1270; unsold.
Joel's, March 1983, lot 1405; unsold.
Coll: Private collection.

- 165 MAGNOLIAS
1933
Oil on canvas, 63 x 78
Insc: Shore 33, lr.
Prov: Joel's, May 1978, lot 609; sold \$2200.
Coll: Castlemaine Art Gallery (Ledger Private Coll.).
- 166 THE CHEF
1933
Oil on canvas, 86.2 x 51.5
Insc: Shore 34, lr.
Ill: A Cook's Tour of the National Gallery, NGV,
dust jacket.
EMGB, p55.
Exh: TMP (September) 1933 (as 'Melbourne's Oldest
Chef'), 30gns.
CG(S) (October) 1933, No. 10, 30gns.
VAS (Spring) 1959, No. 67.
CAG 1973, No. 4.
Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, 1969.
Coll: NGV.
- 167 SPECIAL WASHING
(1933)
Oil on canvas, 31 x 41
Insc: S, lr.
Exh: TMP 1933.
Prov: Exchanged with Harry den Hartog for one of
den Hartog's works, c.1933.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 168 FLOWER PIECE
1933
Oil on canvas, 59.6 x 50.8
Insc: Shore 33, ll.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 14.
Prov: Bill Oliver.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 169 TULIP TREE FLOWERS
c.1933
Oil, c.50 x 40
Exh: TMP 1933, as 'Tulips'. (?)
Prov: Sold by Shore to Mrs Arthur Collins, Geelong.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 170 FLOWER ARRANGEMENT
1933
Oil on canvas, 51.2 x 41
Insc: Shore 33, ll.
Prov: Acquired by current owner 1978.
Coll: Art Gallery of Western Australia.
- 171 NUDE
(1932-36)
Oil on cardboard, 16 x 31.5
Insc: Shore, ll.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Leveson Street
Gallery, 1972.
Coll: ANG.

- 172 MALDON
1933
Oil on canvas on cardboard, 27.0 x 37.2
Insc: Shore 33, lr.
Prov: Bill Oliver.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- Contemporary Group (Melbourne), August 1933:
- 173 BODYLINE, No. 34, 30gns.
174 CITY, No. 35, 30gns.
175 STUDY FOR A CLASSICAL COMPOSITION, No. 36, 15gns.
176 STILL LIFE, No. 37, 15gns.
177 MACROCARPA, No. 38, 15gns.
178 WATTLE, No. 39, 10gns.
- Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1933:
- 179 'CONSIDER THE LILIES', 10gns.
180 NUDE
181 FLOWERS
182 SUNBURY
- Contemporary Group (Sydney), October 1933:
- 183 FLOWERPIECE, No 11, 30gns.
184 STUDY OF THE NUDE
1934
Brown chalk, 37.1 x 29.5 (irreg.)
Insc: Shore 34, lr.
Ill: Whitelaw, B., Australian Drawings of the Thirties and Forties, NGV, p37.
Exh: CG(M) 1934, uncatalogued.
Prov: Purchased by Daryl Lindsay and presented to the current owner, 1934.
Coll: NGV.
- 185 STILL LIFE - VASE OF FLOWERS (ROSES)
1934
Oil on canvas, 62 x 52
Insc: Shore 34, lr.
Prov: Purchased by current owner, 1934, for 20 guineas (SB).
Coll: Geelong Grammar School.
- 186 THE INVITATION
(c.1934)
Oil on canvas, 78 x 95.5
Insc: Shore '36, lr.
Ill: Progress in Australia, October 8, 1934, p26.
Manuscripts, No. 11, November 25, 1934, p45.
Exh: CG(M) 1934, No. 47, 50gns.
Prov: Given by Shore to the Church of England Women's Guild, Mt. Macedon, 1939 (SB).
Coll: Church of England, Macedon.

- 187 CHINESE MAGNOLIAS
1934
Oil on canvas, 49.5 x 60
Insc: Shore '34, lr.
Prov: Sold through Fred Ward to Mr Buchanan, 1935,
12 guineas (SB).
Joel's, November 1979, lot 136A; sold \$900.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 188 CACTUS
c.1934
Oil
Prov: Sold to Marcus Martin, 1934, for 10 guineas.
Later sold to Tristan Beusst (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- Contemporary Group (Melbourne), July-August 1934:
- 189 QUINGES, No. 44, 30gns.
190 GENTLEMAN, No. 45, 30gns.
191 STUDY, No. 46, 20gns.
192 STREET INCIDENT, No. 48, 50gns.
193 POMEGRANATES, No. 49, 15gns.
- Contemporary Group (Sydney), August 1934:
- 194 NUDE STUDY, No. 5, 30gns.
Also TMP 1934, No. 103, 30gns. (?)
- Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1934:
- 195 STILL LIFE, No. 102, 20gns.
196 FLOWERS, No. 104, 10gns.
197 INDIAN AZALEAS, No. 105, 10gns.
- 198 NUDE
1935
Pencil, 32.1 x 19.8 (image)
Insc: Shore 1935, lr.
Verso: Miss Friedman (?) 5 min pose Arnold Shore
(In Justin Gill's hand): Arnold was very
satisfied with this drawing - one of his
best in his opinion (at our place about
1960)
Exh: TMP 1935, No. 108, 3gns.
Prov: Justin Gill.
Coll: Private collection, Bendigo.
- 199 STRELITZIA AUGUSTA
1935
Oil on board, 90 x 70
Insc: Shore 35, lr.
Exh: CG(M) 1935, 20gns.
Prov: Purchased by Lady Casey from CG(M) 1935 (although
SB states Group 12).
Presented to current owner, 1968.
Coll: Hamilton Art Gallery.

- 200 REDS
1935
Pencil and watercolour, 42.5 x 54.5
Insc: Shore '35, lr.
Exh: TMP 1935, No. 105, 5gns.
Prov: Purchased by Maisie Newbold (later Lady Drysdale) from TMP 1935.
Presented by Lady Drysdale, through Joseph Brown, to current owner, 1976.
Coll: Monash University.
- 201 BLUES
1935
Crayon and coloured inks on white bond paper, 57.9 x 45.3
Insc: Shore '35 (?), lr.
Exh: TMP 1935, No. 106, 5gns.
Prov: Purchased by Dr Felix Meyer from TMP 1935.
Presented by the Mary Meyer estate to current owner, 1975.
Coll: ANG.
- 202 PORTRAIT OF JUSTICE EVATT
1935
Oil on canvas, 100 x 75
Insc: Shore 35; lr.
Ill: Table Talk, November 1, 1935, p27.
Exh: CG(M) 1935 (July),
CG(S) 1935 (August), No. 4.
CAG 1973, No. 6.
Prov: Shore's first portrait commission, for a fee of 50 guineas.
Coll: Private collection.
- 203 LADY BALDWIN SPENCER
1935
Oil on canvas on plywood, 60 x 47
Insc: Shore 14-12-35, ll.
Exh: Group 12, 1936, No. 53.
Macq. 1937, No. 2.
Prov: Shore's second portrait commission.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 204 GLADIOLI (EXPLOSION)
1935
Oil on canvas, 75 x 62.2
Insc: Shore 35 (?), lr.
Exh: CG(M) 1935 (on loan).
Prov: Purchased from Shore by Mrs R.G. Casey, 1935, for 10 guineas (SB).
Presented to current owner by Lady Casey, 1981.
Coll: ANG.
- 205 NUDE
1935
"Line and wash"
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 17.
Prov: Catalogued in 1957 as in the possession of the artist.
Whereabouts unknown.

- 206 FLOWERING GUM (FICIFOLIA)
 c.1935
 Oil
 Ill: Sun, June 25, 1935, p13.
 Exh: Group 12, 1935, 10gns.
 Prov: Purchased by Mrs Percy Grainger from Group 12,
 1935; sent to Sweden (SB).
 Whereabouts unknown.
- Contemporary Group (Melbourne), July 1935:
- 207 FLOWERPIECE, 40gns.
 208 CANNAS, 30gns.
- Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1935:
- 209 ROSES, No. 104, 20gns.
 210 FLOWER SKETCH, No. 107, 10gns.
 211 DRAWING, No. 109, 3gns.
 212 ROSES
 1936
 Oil on canvas laid down on board, 53.3 x 42.6
 Unsigned (?)
 Ill: Herald, March 1, 1938.
 Sun, March 2, 1938.
 EMGB, p39.
 Exh: Macq. 1937, No. 10, 20gns.
 Group 12, 1937, No. 44, 20gns.
 Herald 'Best Pictures of 1937' exhibition, 1938.
 AGR 1957, No. 23.
 CAG 1973, No. 7.
 Georges Gallery, 'George Bell', 1981, No. 163.
 Prov: Purchased by Mr and Mrs Talbot from Group 12, 1937.
 Mr Winneke (?), Brisbane.
 Resold to Shore (SB).
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 213 ROSES
 1936 (?)
 Oil on canvas, 60 x 50
 Insc: Shore 36 (?), 1r.
 Prov: Joel's, May 1979, lot 1111; sold \$1000.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 214 DARLING STREET, SOUTH YARRA
 1936
 Oil on cardboard, 37 x 45
 Insc: Shore 36, 1r.
 Ill: EMGB, p257.
 Exh: Ath. 1938, No. 68, 15gns.
 CG(S) 1939, No. 11, 15gns.
 AGR 1957, No. 21.
 Georges Gallery, 'George Bell', 1981, No. 162.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 215 ALBANY, W.A., WILDFLOWERS
 1936
 Oil on canvas, 74 x 58.3 (sight)
 Insc: Shore 36, 1r.
 Exh: Macq. 1937, No. 3, 30gns.
 Ath. 1938, No. 15, 30gns.
 Prov: Given by Shore to current owner (his niece).
 Coll: Private collection, Sydney.
- 216 BANKSIAS
 1936
 Oil on canvas laid down on board, 50 x 62.9 (sight)
 Insc: Shore 36, 1l.
 Ill: Art in Australia, August 1936, p61.
Art and Australia, September 1966, pl20.
 FYSF.
 Exh: SSA 1936 (uncatalogued), 15gns.
 Prov: Purchased by Mrs R.G. Casey from SSA 1936.
 Coll: Private collection, Sydney.
- 217 PORTRAIT OF LADY CRESSWELL (Head and shoulders)
 1936
 Oil, c.60 x 50
 Exh: Group 12, 1936, No. 55.
 Prov: Commissioned 1936, 30 guineas.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 218 PORTRAIT OF VICE-ADMIRAL SIR WILLIAM CRESSWELL
 1936
 Oil
 Exh: Group 12, 1936, No. 54.
 Prov: Commissioned 1936, 15 guineas.
 Painted from a photograph (SB).
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 219 DAFFODILS
 c.1936
 Oil
 Prov: Purchased by Mrs Charles Moore, 1936, for 25
 guineas (SB).
 The Sales book records this work's being bought
 from the TMP show, but no work of this title was
 catalogued for any group show in which Shore
 exhibited in 1936. Nor can this work be identified
 by title or price with any other exhibit during
 the thirties.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 220 BALLERINA
 c.1936
 Watercolour
 Prov: Given by Shore to Frater, 1936 (SB).
 Lost.
- 221 STILL LIFE (FLOWERS)
 1936
 Oil, c.40 x 29
 Coll: Private collection, near Hamilton.

- 222 COCONUT AND ITS HUSK
 c.1936
 Oil on canvas, 38.5 x 49
 Insc: Shore, lr.
 Ill: EMGB, p62.
 Exh: TMP 1936 (as 'Cocoanut Study'), No. 98, 10gns.
 Australian Pavilion, French International
 Exhibition, Paris, 1937.
 Ath. 1938, No. 29, 20gns.
 VAS (Autumn) 1957, No. 66.
 AGR 1957, No. 24.
 Georges Gallery, 'George Bell', 1981, No. 161.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 223 FLOWER PIECE
 1936
 Oil on canvas, 91.5 x 75
 Insc: Shore 36, ll.
 Ill: Studio, January 1938, p5.
Art in Australia, November 1938, p49.
 Joseph Brown catalogue, September 1982, No. 55.
 Prov: Purchased by Miss Rona Watt, 1936, 30 guineas (SB).
 Joseph Brown, September 1982.
 Minor alterations were made to the painting
 following the reproduction in Art in Australia.
 Coll: Private collection.
- 224 REVERIE (MADAME FANNY BRISTOW)
 1936-7
 Oil on canvas on wood panel (head section)
 Original dimensions: c.80 x 95
 Head section dimensions: 32.7 x 25.7
 Insc: Shore 36, ur (head section).
 Ill: FYSF.
 Exh: Macq. 1937 (March), No. 1, 75gns.
 Group 12, 1937 (June), No. 40, 75gns.
 AGR 1957, No. 19 (head section).
 Prov: Purchased by current owner from AGR 1957.
 Coll: NGV.
- Group 12, June 1936:
- 225 STILL LIFE: AUTUMN, No. 56, 40gns.
 Also CG(S) 1936 (as 'Autumn'), No. 18, 40gns.
- 226 STILL LIFE: LEAVES, No. 58, 15gns.
 Also CG(S) 1936 (as 'Still Life'), No. 41, 15gns.
- Contemporary Group (Sydney), July 1936:
- 227 CHINESE MAGNOLIAS, No. 19, 20gns.
 Also TMP 1936, No. 95, 20gns; bought by 'Miss
 Alexander's aunt' and taken to England (SB).
- 228 NUDE STUDY, No. 43, 10gns.

Contemporary Group (Melbourne), August 1936:

- 229 LANDSCAPE, 50gns.
 230 FLOWERPIECE, 40gns.
 231 FLOWERPIECE, 15gns.
 232 STUDY, 8gns.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1936:

- 233 PEONIES, No. 96, 10gns.
 234 STUDY, No. 97, 10gns.
 235 SPRING FLOWERS, uncatalogued, 20gns.
 236 FOUR TENS
 1937 (May)
 Oil on canvas, 65.4 x 52.7
 Insc: Shore 37, 11.
 Ill: FYSF (cover).
 Exh: Group 12, 1937, No. 41, 40gns.
 CG(S) 1937, No. 12, 40gns.
 CAG 1973, No. 10.
 Prov: Winner of the (Ballarat) Crouch Prize, 1938.
 Coll: Ballarat Fine Art Gallery.
 237 CAMELLIAS
 1937
 Oil on canvas, 61.2 x 51
 Insc: Shore 37, 1r.
 Ill: FYSF.
Australasian Post, July 10, 1952, p13.
 Exh: TMP 1937, No. 87, 20gns.
 HCAG 1969, No. 3.
 CAG 1973, No. 8.
 Prov: Purchased by current owner, 1937 (Felton Bequest).
 Coll: NGV.
 238 GUMS AND AUTUMN ELM GOLD
 1937
 Oil
 Exh: AGR 1957, No. 25.
 Whereabouts unknown.
 239 LANDSCAPE, WARRANDYTE
 1937
 Oil on canvas, 51.2 x 63.7
 Insc: Shore 37, 1r.
 Verso: "Landscape, Warrandyte" Arnold Shore.
 Prov: Purchased by Mrs Aarons, Warrandyte, 1938, for
 15 guineas (SB).
 Coll: Private collection, Mornington.
 240 THE GARDEN, WATTLE LODGE
 1937
 Oil on canvas laid down on board, 59.6 x 50 (sight)
 Insc: Shore 37, 1r.
 Verso: The Garden "Wattle Lodge" Arnold Shore.
 Exh: Ath. 1938, No. 38, 30gns. (?)
 Prov: Given by Shore to his niece.
 Coll: Private collection, Sydney.

- 241 PORTRAIT OF MRS RUSSELL GRIMWADE
1937
Oil on hardboard, 54.5 x 79
Unsigned (?)
Exh: Acad. 1938 (April), No. 147.
Ath. 1938, No. 1, NFS.
Prov: Commissioned 1937, 100 guineas.
Coll: University of Melbourne (Russell Grimwade Bequest).
- 242 GOLD AND SILVER
1937
Oil on canvas, 55 x 44.8
Insc: Shore 37, 11.
Exh: Macq. 1937, No. 16, 15gns.
Prov: Purchased by Howard Hinton from Macq. 1937.
Coll: City of Armidale (Howard Hinton Collection).
- 243 BANKSIAS
1937
Oil on canvas, 64.2 x 76.2
Ill: Art in Australia, May 1937, p54.
Exh: Macq. 1937, No. 6, 30gns.
Prov: Purchased by Mrs M.T.Treweeke from Macq. 1937
Presented to current owner, 1937.
Coll: Queensland Art Gallery.
- 244 NUDE (BACK VIEW OF A MAN)
1937 (?)
Pencil, 27.5 x 18.9 (image)
Insc: Shore, 1r.
Verso: Nude pencil Arnold Shore.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 26 (dated 1937).
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 245 PROFUSION
c.1937
Oil
Exh: Macq. 1937 (March), No. 30, 15gns.
Group 12, 1937 (June), No. 45, 15gns.
Prov: Purchased by Isabel Tweddle from Group 12, 1937,
for 15 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 246 LILIUM AURATUM
c.1937
Oil
Exh: Macq. 1937 (March), No. 17, 10gns.
SSA (Brisbane Exhibition) 1937 (May), No. 87, 10gns.
Prov: Sold from SSA (Brisbane) 1937 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 247 CHRYSANTHEMUMS
c.1937
Oil
Exh: SSA 1937, No. 150, 40gns.
Ath. 1938, No. 5, 60gns.
Prov: Sold by Shore to Mrs Turton (Shore's house-keeper)
after the Athenaeum one-man exhibition, 1938,
for 15 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.

- 248 CHILIS
c.1937
Oil
Exh: CG(S) 1937, No. 8, 15gns.
Ath. 1938, No. 19, 20gns.
Prov: Given by Shore to one of his nephews after the
Athenaeum one-man show, 1938.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 249 BANKSIAS
1937 (or 1939)
Oil on canvas, 47.0 x 46.1
Insc: Shore 37 (or 39), lr.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- Macquarie Galleries one-man exhibition, March-April 1937:
- 250 FLOWERPIECE, No. 4, 40gns.
Also Group 12, 1937, No. 42, 40gns. (?)
Also CG(M) 1937, 40gns. (?)
- 251 CURIOSITY, No. 5, 40gns.
- 252 FLOWERING GUM AND TECOMA, No. 7, 15gns.; given to
Bob Mossman (SB).
- 253 GOLD AND BROWN, No. 8, 30gns.
Also CG(M) 1937 (as 'Brown and Gold'), 30gns.
- 254 FLOWERS, No. 9, 30gns.
Also SSA (Brisbane) 1937, No. 88, 30gns. (?)
Also CG(S) 1937, No. 9, 30gns. (?)
- 255 OCEANIA, No. 11, 40gns.
Also TMP 1937, No. 84, 40gns.
- 256 AUTUMN FLOWERS, No. 12, 30gns.
- 257 GROTESQUE, NO. 13, 10gns.
Also Ath. 1938, No. 25, 20gns. (?)
- 258 THE ELLIPTICAL ONE, No. 14, 15gns.
Also Ath. 1938, No. 21, 20gns.
- 259 ARABESQUE, No. 15, 10gns.
- 260 BARRAWONGS, No. 18, 15gns.
- 261 BANKSIA BLUES, No. 20, 15gns.; given to Mrs R.D.Elliott.
- 262 POMEGRANATES, No. 21, 15gns.
- 263 CACTI SKETCH, No.22, 5gns.; bought by Stella Scroggie.
- 264 CAMELLIA, No. 23, 10gns.
- 265 QUINCES, No. 24, 20gns.; given to Clara Southern.
- 266 STILL LIFE, No. 25, 10gns.
- 267 MORNING: "WATTLE LODGE", No. 28, 10gns; bought by
Stella Scroggie.
- 268 AFTERNOON: "WATTLE LODGE", No. 29, 10gns.

Contemporary Group (Sydney), July 1937:

- 269 CHILIS, No. 8, 15gns.
 Also VAS (Spring) 1937, No. 41, 20gns.
 Also Ath. 1938, No. 19, 20gns; given to nephew.
- 270 APPLES AND PEARS, No. 11, 10gns.
 Also Ath. 1938, No. 17, 20gns. (?); destroyed.

Contemporary Group (Melbourne), August 1937:

- 271 STILL LIFE, 60gns.
 Also SSA 1937, No. 172, 60gns.
- 272 AUTUMN, 30gns.
 Also Acad. 1938, No 124, 35gns.

Society of Artists, September 1937:

- 273 STILL LIFE, No. 152, 50gns.
- 274 PERSIMMONS, No. 156, 20gns.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1937:

- 275 PAT, No. 85, NFS.
- 276 IMPROMPTU IN PINK, No. 86, 20gns.
- 277 SPRING, No. 88, 20gns.
- 278 IRIS, No. 89, 15gns.

Victorian Artists' Society, Spring 1937:

- 279 CHINESE TULIP TREE, oil, No. 51, 30gns.
- 280 CHENISTON ROAD, MACEDON
 1938
 Oil on composite board, 37.5 x 51.8
 Insc: Shore 38, lr.
 Verso: "Cheniston Road", Macedon 1938
 To Jess and Mamie, Christmas 1938
 Arnold Shore.
 Exh: Ath. 1938, No. 56, 20gns.
 Prov: Given by Shore to current owners, 1938.
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 281 CHRYSANTHEMUMS
 1938
 Oil
 Exh: Group 12, 1938, No. 41 (on loan).
 Prov: Commissioned by Mrs Lew White, Geelong, 1938,
 20 guineas.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 282 FOREST DEPTHS
 1938
 Oil
 Exh: CG(S) 1939, No. 10, 15gns.
 AGR 1957, No. 27.
 Whereabouts unknown.

- 283 BLACK FOREST, MACEDON
1938
Oil on board, 56.5 x 40
Insc: Shore 38, 1l.
Verso: Bought by Sir Keith Murdoch from 1938
show at Athenaeum Gallery recommended by
Basil Burdett to KM. Bought by Aubrey
Gibson Esq. from the sale of Sir K.M.'s
pictures after his death.
Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, September 1982, Pl 54.
Exh: Ath. 1938, No. 46, 25gns.
Aubrey Gibson Collection, NGV, 1969, No. 85.
Prov: As in verso inscription.
Sold through Joseph Brown to current owner,
September 1982.
Coll: Warrnambool Art Gallery.
- 284 THE STABLE, NANDI
1938
Oil on canvas on ply-wood
Insc: Shore 38, 1r.
Verso: To Chummie from Arnold 1939
Exh: Ath. 1938, No. 53, 35gns.
Prov: Given by Shore to his niece, Ida Ingles (nee
Owen) 1939 in the Davis Avenue studio.
Sold by Mrs Ingles son to current owner, 1981.
Coll: Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery.
- 285 PINK ROSES
1938
Oil on canvas, 48.8 x 58.4
Insc: Shore 38, 1r.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 286 STREET, SOUTH YARRA
c1938
Watercolour
Prov: Given by Shore to Miss Edith Alston, 1938 (SB).
Lost.
- 287 PORTRAIT OF MRS DAVID HUNTER (Head and bust)
1938
Oil
Prov: Commissioned by sitter, 1938, 100 guineas.
A note in the Sales book reads: "Worked for
weeks on this over 40 sittings."
Whereabouts unknown.
- 288 (TREE FORMS)
1938
Watercolour, 35 x 25 (image)
Insc: Shore 38, 1r.
Coll: Private collection, Dean, Victoria.
- 289 THE FARMYARD, NANDI
1938
Oil
Insc: Shore 38 (?), 1r.
Ill: Sun, August 17, 1938.
Exh: Ath. 1938, No. 59, 25gns.
Prov: Purchased by Percy Grainger from Ath. 1933.
Whereabouts unknown.

- 290 HYDRANGEAS
1938
Oil on board, 73.3 x 73.3
Exh: Ath. 1938, No. 31, 40gns.
Prov: Purchased by Russell Grimwade from Ath. 1938 (SB).
Coll: University of Melbourne (Russell Grimwade Bequest).
- 291 AUTUMN
c.1938
Oil
Insc: Shore 38 (?), lr.
Ill: Art in Australia, May 1938, p34.
Exh: Acad. 1938, No. 124, 35gns.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 292 HOT DAYS (SELF PORTRAIT)
1938
Oil on canvas on board, 55 x 36
Insc: Shore 1938, lr.
Ill: Christesen, C.B. (ed.), The Gallery on Eastern Hill, VAS, p22.
Exh: Ath. 1938, No. 4, NFS.
CG(S) 1939, No. 8, 30gns.
AGR 1957, No. 22.
GAG 1973, No. 9.
PSG 1977, No. 1.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 293 BUSH: MT. TOWRONG
1938
Oil, 39.4 x 56.5
Exh: Ath. 1938, No. 51, 20gns.
Coll: Mildura Arts Centre.
- 294 AT JAMIESON
1938
Gouache, 33 x 40.5
Insc: Shore 38, lr.
Coll: Private collection, Dean, Victoria.
- 295 JAMIESON RIVER AND VALLEY
1938
Oil on board, 41 x 33
Insc: Shore 38, lr.
Prov: Sold at Joel's, September 24, 1971, lot 31.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 296 JAMIESON STORE
(1938?)
Oil
Prov: Sold by Shore to Clyde School, Woodend, 1943 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown. (The Sales book records three oil sketches sold to Clyde in 1943 for 7½ guineas each. Only one, Cat. no. 496, is known at Geelong Grammar School, with which Clyde later merged.)

Group 12, June 1938:

- 297 ARABESQUE, No. 42, 20gns.
Also Ath. 1938, No. 33, 20gns. (destroyed).
- 298 BUSH, No. 43, 15gns.
- 299 THE TRACK, No. 44, 15gns.
- 300 STILL LIFE, No. 45, 15gns.

Athenaeum Gallery, one-man exhibition, August 1938:

(Athenaeum catalogue numbers 1-70 are oils; numbers 71-80 are watercolours or drawings.)

- 301 CHINESE MAGNOLIAS, No. 7, 30gns.; sold to Mrs Clive Rowan.
- 302 WHITE FLOWERS, No. 8, 40gns.; given to 'Mrs Davis Avenue'.
- 303 STRELITZIAS: RUSSIAN BALLET, No. 11, 40gns.; given to Mrs Clive Rowan.
- 304 FLOWERS (Mixed Bunch, c.100 x 75), No. 12, 50gns.; sold to Sir Keith Murdoch.
- 305 VICTORIA MARKET: STILL LIFE, No. 16, 30gns.; given to nephew.
- 306 SPRINGTIME, No. 20, 20gns.; sold to Lady Murdoch.
- 307 SUNNY DAY, No. 37, 35gns.; sold to W.H.McKie and taken to England.
- 308 THE BUSH, No. 39, no price; sold to Mrs R.D.Elliott for 5 guineas (SB).
- 309 BEHIND "DARRIWEIT", No. 40, 25gns.; sold to Mrs Sutton.
- 310 AFTER BUSH FIRES, No. 45, 20gns.; sold to Mrs R.G.Casey.
- 311 BACK TO MELBOURNE, No. 47, 20gns.; sold to Frederick Howard.
- 312 MT. TOWRONG: THE TRACK, MORNING, No. 50, 20gns.; sold to Mr (Norman?) Smail.
- 313 "DREAMTHORPE" AUTUMN, No. 54, 30gns.; sold to Miss Ises.
- 314 THE POINTING BRANCH, No. 55, 30gns.; sold to boys of Geelong Grammar School for 14 guineas as a present for Mr W.H.McKie; taken to England.
- 315 THE GOVERNOR'S DRIVE, No. 57, 25gns.; given to Mrs (David) Hunter.
- 316 WOOD PILE, No. 62, 15gns.; given to Lionel Massey.
- 317 THE TOP OF THE HILL, No. 67, 30gns.; sold to Mrs David Hunter.
- 318 SKETCH: LYSTERFIELD, No. 69, 5gns.; sold to Miss G.Holmes.
- 319 SKETCH: LYSTERFIELD, No. 70, 6gns.; given to Miss Holmes.
- 320 EVENING, MACEDON, No. 73, 10gns.; given to Mrs McKenny.
- 321 WINDY MORNING, No. 76, 5gns.; given (?) to Mrs Campey.
- 322 NANDI: KITCHEN, No. 79, 3gns.; sold (?) to Miss Craig.

Athenaeum Gallery, 1938 (cont.)

- 323 BOUQUET, No. 6, 40gns. (destroyed).
 324 RIOT: MACEDON LEAVES AND HOLLY, No. 13, 40gns.
 325 BERWICK: FLOWERS, No. 14, 30gns.
 326 CAMELLIAS, No. 18, 20gns.
 327 CHINESE MAGNOLIAS, No.22, 20gns.
 328 POMEGRANATES, No. 23, 25gns.
 329 STILL LIFE WITH TOY CAT, No. 26, 20gns.
 330 IRIS, No. 27, 25gns. (destroyed).
 331 STILL LIFE, No. 28, 15gns. (lost).
 332 PROTEA, No. 30, 25gns. (destroyed).
 333 STILL LIFE, No. 32, 15gns. (destroyed)
 334 ROSES, No. 34, 30gns. (scrapped).
 335 STILL LIFE AND LEAVES, No. 35, 40gns.
 Also CG(S) 1939, No. 6, 40gns.
 336 MACEDON AHEAD, No. 36, 100gns.
 337 AFTERNOON IN "HUNTLY BURN", No. 41, 30gns. (destroyed).
 338 THE LAKE "WILLOWMOUNT", No. 42, 20gns. (destroyed).
 339 ENGLISH TREES IN THE BUSH, No. 43, 30gns.
 340 CLEARING MORNING, No. 44, 20gns. (scrapped).
 341 MT. TOWRONG: THE TRACK, GREY AFTERNOON, No. 48, 20gns.
 (destroyed).
 342 MT. TOWRONG: THE TRACK, SUNSHINE, No. 49, 20gns.
 343 FROM THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, No. 52, 30gns. (destroyed).
 344 TANGLE, No. 58, 20gns. (destroyed).
 345 SUNSET: MT. TOWRONG, No. 60, 25gns. (destroyed).
 346 THE VEGETABLE GARDEN, No. 61, 20gns.
 347 HIGH UP, No. 64, 25gns.
 348 MOUNTAIN SIDE, No. 65, 15gns.
 Also Vol. 1940, No. 63, 10gns..
 349 NOON, ANZAC ROAD, No. 66, 25gns.
 350 WARRANDYTE SKETCH, No. 71, 5gns.
 351 TREES, No. 72, 3gns.
 352 THE GATEWAY, MACEDON, No. 74.
 353 COMO PARK, No. 75.
 354 GUM TRUNKS, No. 77, 3gns.
 355 CHINESE ELM, No. 78, 5gns. (scrapped).
 356 NANDI: THE RANGE, No. 80, 3gns.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1938:

- 357 FLOWERPIECE, No. 89, 30gns.
 358 ROSES, No. 90, 25gns.
 359 NEAR CROYDON, No. 91, 8gns.
- 360 DAHLIAS
 1939
 Oil on canvas, 76.8 x 64.5
 Insc: Shore 39, lr.
 Prov: Winner of the (Geelong) McPhillimy Prize, 1939.
 Coll: Geelong Art Gallery.
- 361 THE VEGETABLE GARDEN
 1939
 Oil on canvas, 50 x 60
 Insc: Shore 39, lr.
 Ill: Studio, October 1942, p135.
Smith, B., Australian Painting, 1971, p213.
 Exh: Velasquez Gallery, 1940, No. 20, 40gns.
 Australian Art Exhibition touring U.S.A. and
 Canada, 1942.
 Prov: Purchased by current owner from Vel. 1940
 (Felton Bequest).
 Coll: NGV.
- 362 STILL LIFE
 1939
 Oil on canvas, 90.5 x 70.3
 Insc: Shore 39, lr.
 Exh: Acad. 1939, No. 77, 50gns.
 Prov: Purchased by current owner from Acad. 1939,
 recommended by Louis McCubbin.
 Coll: Art Gallery of South Australia.
- 363 SUMMER, MT. TOWRONG
 1939
 Oil on canvas, 61.4 x 51.3
 Insc: Shore 39, ll.
 Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, 1976.
 Coll: Art Gallery of South Australia.
- 364 (FLOWER STUDY)
 1939
 Oil
 Insc: Shore 39, lr.
 Ref: Known only through a photograph in Shore's first
 scrapbook, p37.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 365 THE HOUSE BEHIND THE FLOWERS
 1939
 Oil on canvas, 63 x 76.5
 Insc: Shore 39, lr.
 Ill: FYSF.
 Exh: Acad. 1940, No. 83, 30gns.
 Vel. 1940, No. 31, 40gns.
 HCAG 1969, No. 4.
 Prov: Purchased by Mrs R.D.Elliott from Vel. 1940;
 presented by Mrs Elliott to current owner.
 Coll: Mildura Arts Centre.

- 366 THE OLD WARRIOR
1939
Oil on board, 48.1 x 34.6 (sight)
Insc: Shore 39, lr.
Verso: The Old Warrior Arnold Shore, "Nandi"
Mt. Macedon, Vic.
Exh: Vel. 1940, No. 61, 10gns.
Macq. 1941, No. 30, 10gns.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

Australian Academy of Art, April 1939:

- 367 MOUNT TOWRONG, No. 28.
368 FARMYARD, No. 53.
Also Vel. 1940, No. 56, 10gns.

Contemporary Group (Sydney), June 1939:

- 369 NEAR DARRAWEIT, No. 7, 20gns.
370 AFTER BUSH FIRES, No. 9, 15gns.

Society of Artists, August 1939:

- 371 BIG TREES, No. 148, 100gns.
372 ROSES, No. 200, 40gns.
Also Vel. 1940, No. 10, 30gns. (destroyed)
373 MT. TOWRONG, No. 223, 50gns.
Also Vel. 1940, No. 18, 50gns.
374 COUNTRY SCENE, MACEDON, No. 237, 60gns.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1939:

- 375 DAHLIAS, No. 91, 40gns.
376 MT. MACEDON: SPRING, No. 92, 40gns.
377 MT. MACEDON: SUMMER, No. 93, 20gns.
378 MT. MACEDON: AUTUMN, No. 94, 20gns.
379 MT. MACEDON: WINTER, No. 95, 30gns.
380 MT. MACEDON: SNOW, No. 96, 20gns.

- 381 DAHLIAS
1940
Oil on canvas, 60 x 50
Insc: Shore 40, lr.
Exh: Georges 1946, No. 4 (?), 40gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Georges 1946.
Coll: Shepparton Art Gallery.

- 382 FIGURES IN THE GARDEN, MACEDON
1940
Oil on canvas, 45.5 x 40.5
Insc: Shore 40, ll.
Prov: Joel's, May 1981, lot 783; sold \$3600 (then a record for a Shore at auction).
Coll: Private collection, Adelaide (?).

- 383 STILL LIFE
1940 (March)
Oil on canvas, 64.3 x 77.3
Insc: Shore 40, 1r.
Exh: Macq. 1941, No. 6, 40gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Macq. 1941.
Ref: Smith, B., Catalogue of Australian Oil Paintings
in the National Art Gallery of N.S.W. 1876-1952.
Coll: AGNSW.
- 384 HYDRANGEAS
1940
Oil on canvas, 76.8 x 64.2
Insc: Shore 40, 1r.
Verso: "Flowers Arnold Shore"
Prov: Purchased from Shore by Mrs R.G. Casey, April 1952,
30gns. (SB); returned to Mrs Shore, 1981.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 385 VALLEY (GREEN LANDSCAPE)
c.1940
Oil on canvas, 61.8 x 44.6
Insc: Shore, 1r.
Verso (on stretcher): "Valley" Arnold Shore
Ill: 'Aspects of Australian Art 1900-1940', exhibition
catalogue, 1978-9, p55.
Exh: 'Aspects of Australian Art 1900-1940', ANG
travelling exhibition, 1978-9, No. 61.
Prov: Lent by Shore to Mrs R.G. Casey, 1940 (?); hung in
Australian Embassy, Washington D.C..
Purchased by Commonwealth of Australia, 1949.
Ref: SB, 1940 and 1949.
Coll: ANG.
- 386 STILL LIFE WITH CABBAGES
1940
Oil on composite board, 45.3 x 61
Insc: Shore 40, 1c.
Ill: EMGB, p258.
Exh: Vel. 1940 (as 'Cabbages'), No. 16; 30gns.
AGR 1957 (as 'Cabbages and Eggs'), No. 31, 40gns.
Georges Gallery, 'George Bell', 1981, No. 159.
Prov: Brian Finemore.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- Australian Academy of Art, March-April 1940:
- 387 FLOWERPIECE, No. 148, 30gns.
Contemporary Group (Sydney), July-August 1940:
- 388 SNOW, No. 10, 15gns.
Velasquez Gallery one-man exhibition, August 1940:
- 389 THE FIRE BREAK, No. 1, 200gns.
390 AFTERMATH, No. 2, 50gns.
391 RHODODENDRONS, No. 3, 40gns.
392 SPRING ROSES, No. 4, 30gns.

Velasquez Gallery, 1940 (cont.)

- 393 FLOWERPIECE, No. 5, 40gns.
 394 HYDRANGEAS, No. 6, 40gns. (destroyed).
 395 FLOWERPIECE, No. 7, 40gns.
 396 SPRING BLOSSOMS, No. 8, 30gns.
 397 AUTUMN ROSES, No. 9, 30gns.
 398 GRAPE HYACINTHS, No. 11, 20gns.
 399 FLOWERPIECE, No. 12, 20gns.
 400 RHODODENDRONS, No. 13, 30gns.
 Also Macq. 1941, No. 1, 30gns.
 401 SPRING FLOWERS, No. 14, 10gns.
 402 BRUSSELS SPROUTS, No. 15, 30gns.
 Also Macq. 1941, No. 7, 30gns.
 403 MUSHROOMS, No. 17, 25gns.
 404 BUSH ROAD, No. 19, 30gns.; sold to Miss L.Foulsham;
 willed back to Shore, and repainted 1949 (SB).
 405 THE CHURCH, No. 21, 30gns.
 406 BUSH, No. 22, 30gns.
 407 DROUGHT TIME, No. 23, 30gns.
 408 WINTER AFTERNOON, No. 24, 30gns.
 409 THIS WAY, THAT WAY, No. 25, 30gns.
 410 THE STABLE, No. 26, 30gns.
 411 BLACK WATTLE TREE, No.27, 25gns.
 412 AMETHYST AND GREEN, No. 28, 25gns.
 413 AUTUMN, No. 29, 30gns.
 414 BLOWY DAY, No. 30, 30gns.
 Also Macq. 1941, No. 16, 25gns.; sold to J.Jackson.
 415 SPRING, MT. MACEDON, No. 32, 50gns.
 416 THE RED WHITE GUM, No. 33, 20gns.
 417 THE GARDEN, No. 34, 20gns.; sold to Major Brooks,
 for 10 guineas (SB).
 418 HAVOC, No. 35, 20gns.
 419 MOUNT ROBERTSON, No. 36, 20gns.
 420 THE DRIVE, No. 37, 20gns.
 421 AFTERNOON, No. 38, 20gns.
 422 EVENING, No. 39, 20gns.
 423 WINTER RAINBOW, No. 40, 30gns.
 424 RESURRECTION, No. 41, 20gns.
 Also Macq. 1941, No. 19, 15gns.; sold to J.H.McGregor.
 425 SUMMER, No. 42, 20gns.
 426 SPRING DAY, No. 43, 10gns.

Velasquez Gallery, 1940 (cont.)

- 427 SNOW SCENE, No. 44, 15gns.; sold to Basil Burdett, for 5 guineas (SB).
- 428 COLOUR NOTE, No. 45, 5gns.
Also Macq. 1941, No. 24, 5gns.
- 429 MYSTIC LAKE, No. 46, 5gns.
Also Macq. 1941 (as 'Magic Lake'), No. 23, 5gns.
- 430 MOUNT MACEDON, No. 47, 5gns.; sold to Pat Lowy after the exhibition for 4½ guineas (SB).
- 431 THE CREEK, No. 48, 5gns.
- 432 SUNSET, No. 49, 5gns.
- 433 EVENING, No. 50, 5gns.
- 434 THE DAM, No. 51, 10gns.
- 435 MOUNT TOWRONG, No. 52, 10gns.; sold to Mr C.Ingleby.
- 436 OLD FELLOWS, No. 53, 15gns.
Also Macq. 1941, No. 26, 10gns.
- 437 GREY DAY, No. 54, 10gns.
Also Macq. 1941, No. 29, 10gns.
Also Georges 1945, No. 21, 15gns. (?)
- 438 CURVING ROAD, No. 55, 10gns.
- 439 GRASS, TREES, No. 57, 10gns.
Also Macq. 1941, No. 27, 10gns.; given to F.H.Lemann.
- 440 MESSMATE, No. 58, 10gns.
- 441 AFTER FIRES, No. 59, 10gns.
- 442 BUSH TRACK, No. 60, 10gns.; sold to A.B.Howie, for 5 guineas (SB).
- 443 BIG TREES, No. 62, 10gns.
- 444 JAMIESON RIVER, No. 64, 10gns.
- 445 JAMIESON VALLEY, No. 65, 10gns.
- 446 MARY ANN DALE'S, No. 66, 10gns.
Also Macq. 1941, No. 31, 10gns.; sold after this exhibition for 5 guineas (SB).
- 447 OLD STORE, JAMIESON, No. 67, 10gns.
- 448 SUMMER MORNING, No. 68, 30gns.
- 449 BLUE MORNING, No. 69, 15gns.; sold to A.B.Howie, for 6 guineas (SB).
- 450 THE VEGETABLE PATCH, No. 70, 20gns.
Also Macq. 1941, No. 9, 15gns.

- 451 THE PARK
1941 (August)
Oil on plywood panel, 57 x 41.2
Insc: Shore 41, lr.
Ill: Art in Australia, December 1941, p66.
Exh: SSA 1941, 15gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from SSA 1941, prior to the opening of the exhibition.
Ref: Smith, B., Catalogue of Australian Oil Paintings in the National Art Gallery of N.S.W. 1876-1952.
Coll: AGNSW.
- 452 THE PEAR TREE, NANDI
1941
Oil on canvas, 61.2 x 61.8
Insc: Shore 41, lr.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 32.
Prov: Purchased by Bill Oliver, 1943, for £15 (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 453 DECORATIVE FRUIT PIECE
1941
Oil on canvas, 102 x 77
Insc: Shore 41, lr.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- Macquarie Galleries one-man exhibition, February 1941:
- 454 FOLIAGE AND FLOWERS, No. 2, 40gns.
455 HORSE CHESTNUTS, No. 3, 30gns. (destroyed).
456 PEARL RHODODENDRONS, No. 4, 50gns.; sold to Mrs Rodney Dangar, for 35 guineas (SB).
457 WHITE LILAC, No. 5, 40gns. (destroyed).
458 WINTER AFTERNOON, No. 8, 25gns.
459 SUMMER GOLD, No. 10, 25gns.
460 SWAMP GUMS, No. 11, 20gns.
461 MIST AND RAIN, No. 12, 30gns.
462 WINTER RAINBOW, No. 13, 20gns.
463 EARLY SUMMER, No. 14, 30gns.
464 SOFT MORNING, No. 15, 25gns.
465 ROSES, No. 17, 20gns.; given to Maisie McGregor, Bacchus Marsh (SB).
466 WATTLE SCRUB, No. 18, 15gns.; sold to F.H.Lemann.
467 SPRING FLOWERS, No. 20, 5gns.
468 SHE OAKS, No. 21, 10gns.
469 OVER THE HILLS, No. 22, 5gns.; sold to Miss Stella Scroggie.
470 NORTH WIND, No. 25, 5gns.; sold to Mrs Charles Shore.
471 MORNING IMPRESSION, No. 28, 10gns.
472 THE OLD STORE, No. 32, 10gns.

Australian Academy of Art, April 1941:

- 473 AIRSCAPE, No. 11, 50gns.
This work was described in a review of the exhibition
(Age, April 10, 1941) as a view, through an opening
in the clouds, of the earth below.
- 474 FECUNDITY, No. 13, 100gns.

Contemporary Group (Sydney), July 1941:

- 475 NANDI, No. 2, 30gns.
Also TMP 1941, No. 85, 30gns.
- 476 PLUMS, No. 15, 20gns.
Also TMP 1941, No. 86, 20gns.
- 477 DAHLIAS, No. 18, 30gns.
Also TMP 1941, No. 84, 30gns.
- 478 MORNING LIGHT, No. 19, 15gns.
Also TMP 1941, No. 87, 15gns.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1941:

- 479 MOUNT MACEDON, No. 89, 8gns.
- 480 TIGER LILIES
1942
Oil on canvas, 49 x 59
Insc: Shore 42, 1c.
Exh: 'Glimpses of the Forties', Heide Park and Art
Gallery, 1982, No. 56.
Prov: Purchased from Shore by Mrs A.B.Scott as a present
for her daughter, the future Agnes Shore, 1942.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 481 ZINNIAS
1942
Pastel, 49.5 x 35.5 (image)
Insc: Shore '42, 1r.
Exh: TMP 1942, No. 83, 10gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from TMP 1942, for
6 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Dean, Victoria.
- 482 RICH COUNTRY
c.1942
Oil, c.50 x 60
Exh: SSA 1942, No. 162, 25gns.
Prov: Sold through Macquarie Galleries, Sydney, 1946,
for 25 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 483 (TREES AND SHED)
1942
Oil on cardboard, 55.5 x 38
Insc: Shore '42, 1c.
Exh: TMP 1942, No. 86, 10gns. (?)
Prov: Dr A.A.Phillips.
This work was painted from almost the same position
as was 'Mt. Gisborne' of 1945, Cat. no. 542.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

- 484 GREY DAY, MT. TOWRONG
1942
Oil on canvas, 58 x 47
Insc: Shore '42, lr.
Prov: Joel's, November 1975, lot 105; sold \$425.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 485 THE SHED AND THE TREE
c.1942
Oil, c.60 x 50
Exh: CG(S) 1942, No. 17, 25gns.
Prov: Purchased by Mrs Charles Shore from CG(S) 1942.
Whereabouts unknown.
- Contemporary Group (Sydney), June 1942:
- 486 MT. TOWRONG, No. 16, 25gns.
487 STILL LIFE, No. 18, 30gns.
- Society of Artists, September 1942:
- 488 GREY DAY IN THE BUSH, No. 160, 25gns.
- Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1942:
- 489 ANNO DOMINI, No. 82, 100gns.
490 THE HAIRPIN BEND, No. 84, 10gns.
491 WINTRY DAY, No. 85, 10gns.
- 492 COUNTRY RESIDENCE
1943 (July)
Oil on canvas on caneite, 40.8 x 57.1
Insc: Shore 43, lr.
Ill: Society of Artists Book, 1943, pl2.
FYSF.
Exh: SSA 1943, No. 147, 20gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from SSA 1943.
Ref: Smith, B., Catalogue of Australian Oil Paintings
in the National Art Gallery of N.S.W. 1876-1952.
Coll: AGNSW.
- 493 THE MILKING SHED
1943
Oil
Prov: Sold by Shore to Mr Keith Wenzel, 1945, 5 guineas.
Sold at Joel's, March 1957 (SB 1945 and 1957).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 494 (FRUIT TREES IN BLOSSOM)
1943
Oil
Prov: Sold to Mr Keith Wenzel, 1945, 5 guineas.
Sold at Joel's, March 1957 (SB 1945 and 1957).
Whereabouts unknown.

- 495 VEGETABLE GARDEN, NANDI
1943
Oil on canvas, 50 x 60
Insc: Shore 1943, lr.
Prov: Sold by Shore to the current owner, 1943,
for 15 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Dean, Victoria.
- 496 UNDER THE TREES
1943
Oil on board (?), 26.5 x 37 (sight)
Insc: Shore 43, lr.
Prov: Sold, together with two other sketches, to Clyde
School, Woodend, for 7½ guineas each, 1943 (SB).
The other two sketches are not known at Geelong
Grammar School, with which Clyde later merged.
Coll: Geelong Grammar School (Clyde House).
- 497 THE CLOUD
c.1943 (?)
Oil
Prov: Sold by Shore to Clyde School, Woodend, 1943,
for 7½ guineas (SB). See also Cat. no. 496, 296.
- 498 OLD STABLE, NANDI
1943
Pastel, 29.8 x 38.4
Insc: Verso: Old Stable, Nandi Arnold Shore 1943.
Coll: Private collection, Dean, Victoria.
- 499 GLADIOLI
1943
Oil
Exh: SSA 1943, No. 183, 15gns.
Prov: Purchased by Howard Hinton from SSA 1943.
Presented by Hinton to current owner, 1943.
Coll: City of Armidale (Hinton Collection).
- 500 INTERIOR
1943
Oil
Prov: Commissioned by Capt. Moffatt Pender, Mt. Macedon,
1943, 15 guineas.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 501 DINING ROOM (SKETCH)
1943
Oil
Prov: Given by Shore to Mrs Moffatt Pender, 1943.
Sold at Joel's, 1953, 6 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 502 THE COWSHED
1943
Oil on cardboard, 25 x 35.2 (sight)
Insc: Shore 43, lr.
Verso: "The Cowshed"
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

Australian Academy of Art, July 1943:

- 503 GLADIOLI, No. 2, 50gns.
 504 STILL LIFE, No. 21, 40gns.
 505 LILIUMS AND PLUMS, No. 29, 35gns.

Society of Artists, August 1943:

- 506 WASHING DAY, No. 179, 6gns. (sold)
 507 FARMYARD, No. 186, 6gns. (sold)
 508 RHUS LEAVES AND GLADIOLI, No. 223, 40gns.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1943:

- 509 VEGETABLE FLOWER PIECE, No. 83, 35gns.; this may be the early version of Cat. no. 669, which was repainted in 1949.
 510 LANDSCAPE, No. 84, 20gns.
 511 WINTER SUNLIGHT, No. 85, 15gns.
 512 GREEN TREES, No. 86, 15gns.; sold to A.B.Howie (SB).
 513 AFTERNOON, No. 87, 15gns.; sold from Macquarie Galleries, 1944, 15gns. (SB).
 514 STANDING BY
 1944
 Pastel, 32 x 41 (image)
 Insc: Shore 44, lr.
 Verso: Priced 6 gns.
 Exh: CG(S) 1944, No. 82, 6gns.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
 515 BUSH
 1944
 Oil on cardboard, 38.5 x 28.5
 Insc: Shore 44, lr.
 Exh: SSA 1944, No. 51, 15gns.
 Prov: Lloyd Jones, Sydney (possibly purchased from SSA 1944).
 Joshua McClelland Print Room, 1982.
 Coll: Private collection.
 516 WOODEND
 1944
 Watercolour, 17 x 24.5 (image)
 Insc: Shore 44, lr.
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
 517 WINDY DAY
 1944 (?)
 Oil on canvas on cardboard, 25 x 36
 Insc: Shore 44 (?), ll.
 Prov: Given by Shore to Bill Oliver, 1946 (SB).
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

- 518 FLOWER PIECE
1944
Oil on canvas, 77.5 x 65
Insc: Shore 44, lr.
Ill: Society of Artists Book, 1945-6, p12.
FYSF.
Joseph Brown catalogue, Autumn 1977, No. 57.
Exh: SSA 1945, No. 30, 50gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 6.
Prov: Dr Roland Wettenhall.
Joseph Brown, Autumn 1977.
Ref: SB, 1945, where this work is subtitled 'Grandy's
Birthday Bunch'.
Coll: Private collection.
- 519 COME INTO THE GARDEN, MAUD
1944
Oil on canvas on board, 61 x 45.7
Insc: Shore 1944, ll.
Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, Spring 1972, No. 54.
Exh: Acad. 1944, No. 16, 25gns.
AGR 1957, No. 33.
Prov: Sold by Shore to Bill Oliver, 1944, for 10 guineas.
Joseph Brown, Spring 1972.
Coll: Private collection.
- 520 SPRING
1944
Oil on board, 27.5 x 18.7
Insc: Shore 44, lr.
Exh: Georges 1945, No. 18, 15gns.
Prov: Sold by Shore to current owner, 1946, for
10 guineas (SB).
Coll: Canterbury Girls High School.
- 521 THE CHURCH (MACEDON)
1944
Oil on composite board, 27.2 x 37.5
Insc: Shore 44, lr.
Exh: Georges 1945, No. 16, 15gns.
Prov: Purchased by Dora Ribush from Georges 1945.
Lina Bryans.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 522 NORTH WIND
1944
Oil on cardboard, 25.5 x 37
Insc: Shore 44, lr.
Verso: Wind Coming
Exh: Georges 1945, No. 7, 20gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Georges Gallery,
1947, 10 guineas (SB).
Coll: Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery, Launceston.
- 523 ON TOP OF THE RIDGE
1944
Oil
Insc: Shore 44, lr.
Ill: Society of Artists Book, 1944, p78.
Exh: SSA 1944, No. 46, 20gns.
Whereabouts unknown.

- 524 SILVER LIGHT
c.1944
Oil
Prov: Sold to a friend of William Rowell's, 1944,
for 10 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 525 HEDGE AND CHURCH
1944
Oil on canvas on composite board, 19.4 x 28.3
Insc: Shore 44, 11.
Prov: Sold to Mrs G.C.Lemann, 1944, for 5 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Bowral, N.S.W..
- 526 TREES
c.1944
Oil
Prov: Sold from opening show of Georges Gallery, 1944,
for 15 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- Contemporary Group (Sydney), July 1944:
- 527 FARMYARD, No. 80, 5gns.
528 OUT THE BACK, Pastel, No. 81, 10gns.
Also TMP 1945, No. 71, 10gns.
- Australian Academy of Art, July 1944:
- 529 STILL LIFE IN GREEN AND BROWN, No. 1, 50gns.
530 FLOWER PIECE, No. 10, 40gns.
- Society of Artists, August 1944:
- 531 FEEDING TIME, No. 39, 15gns.
532 NEGLECTED GARDEN, No. 42, 15gns.
533 GREEN'S FLAT, No. 55, 15gns.
534 HILLSIDE, No. 71, 20gns.
- Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1944:
- 535 SHED IN THE COUNTRY, No. 80, 40gns.
Also SSA 1945, No. 147.
536 A SUNNY CORNER, No. 81, 20gns.
Also Georges 1945, No. 1, 20gns.; sold to Mrs Lobb (SB).
537 WASHING DAY, No. 82, 15gns.; given to Mr and Mrs Harry
Leith, 1946 (SB).
538 MORNING, No. 83, 15gns.
- 539 WINTER TOLL
1945
Oil on canvas board, 28.5 x 38
Insc: Shore 45, 1r.
Exh: Georges 1945, No. 2, 15gns.
Prov: Purchased by Joan Lindsay from Georges 1945.
Purchased by current owner from Artarmon Gallery,
1973.
Coll: ANG.

- 540 ON MOUNT TOWRONG
1945
Oil on canvas on board, 39 x 29.9
Insc: Shore, ll.
Verso: "On Mount Towrong" Mount Macedon
Victoria 1945 Arnold Shore.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 541 PIGSTY AND SHED
1945
Oil
Exh: Georges 1946, No. 10, 25gns.
Macq. 1947, No. 21, 25gns.
AGR 1957, No. 35, 40gns.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 542 MT. GISBORNE
(c.1945)
Oil on canvas on particle board, 48.5 x 44.6
Unsigned.
Exh: Georges 1945, No. 14, 25gns.
Prov: Sold by Shore to Bill Oliver, 1945, for £15 (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 543 THE FOWL YARD
1945
Oil on cardboard, 20.4 x 28.9
Insc: Shore 45, lr.
Exh: Fern Tree Gully Arts Society, June 1981, No.119.
Prov: Purchased by Miss B.Tippetts from a Fern Tree
Gully Arts Society exhibition, early 1960s (?).
Purchased by current owner from Miss Tippetts, 1981.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 544 MOUNTAIN MIST
c.1945
Oil
Prov: Sold through Edith Smart from Victoria League
club rooms, 1945, 10 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 545 UP FOR A FEW DAYS
1945
Pastel, 61 x 69.8
Insc: Shore '45, lr.
Exh: TMP 1945, No. 70, 10gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from TMP 1945.
Coll: NGV.
- 546 (MACEDON BUSH)
1945
Oil on paper on board, 55.5 x 39.5
Insc: Shore 45, lr.
Prov: Lady Casey
Coll: Private collection, Sydney.
- 547 EVENING: MAIN ROAD, MT. MACEDON
1945
Oil
Prov: Sold by Shore to Pat Lowy, 1945, for 5 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.

- 548 TULIPS
c.1945
Oil
Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 5.
Prov: Purchased by Mrs Hamilton Sleigh from Blue Door
Gallery, 1945, for 25 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection.
- 549 WINDY DAY
1945
Oil on board, 19.9 x 29.5
Insc: Shore 45, lr.
Verso: Windy Day Arnold Shore
Exh: Georges 1945, No.11, 10gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Georges 1945,
for 5 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Dean, Victoria.
- 550 LILIUMS AND PLUMS
c.1945
Oil
Prov: Purchased by Mrs R.Kemp, Bolobek, Macedon, 1945,
for £22 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.

Georges Gallery one-man exhibition, May 1945:

- 551 TREE CONTRASTS, No. 3, 15gns.
552 DUSTY SKY, No. 4, 10gns. (sold)
553 BUSH, No. 5, 10gns.; sold to Lina Bryans.
554 AUTUMN, No 6, 35gns. (sold)
555 BUSH FORMS, No. 8, 15gns.
Also CG(S) 1945, 15gns.
556 BRIGHT DAY, No. 9, 15gns.
557 GREEN BUSH, No. 12, 15gns.; given to Robert Haines.
558 SPRINGTIME, No. 10, 25gns.
559 BROWN BUSH, No. 13, 15gns.
560 A SPOT OF WASHING, No. 15, 15gns.
561 A CLEAN FOREST FLOOR, No. 17, 20gns.
562 NEAR THE WILLIMIGONGON, No. 19, 10gns.; sold to
Mrs R.D.Elliott.
563 THE SHELL, No. 20, 10gns.
564 LOWER MACEDON, No. 22, 15gns.
565 WOOD STACKS, No. 23, 20gns.
566 BUSH TEXTURES, No. 24, 15gns.
Also CG(S) 1945, No. 2, 15gns.; given to Mrs Mathieson,
1949 (SB).
567 COUNTRY HOUSE, No. 25, 15gns.
568 BUSH TANGLE, No. 26, 15gns.
569 CHOOK ALLEY, No. 27, 15gns.
570 AFTERNOON, No. 28, 25gns.

Georges Gallery, 1945 (cont.)

- 571 MT. MACEDON, No. 29, 10gns.
 572 CONFRETTES, No. 30, 15gns.; given to Beth Thwaites.
 573 CONVERSATION PIECE, No. 31, 15gns.
 Also CG(S) 1945, No. 1, 15gns.; given to Peter Kemp,
 1949 (SB).
 574 APPLES, No. 32, 25gns.
 575 FLOWER PIECE, No. 33, 50gns.
 576 SHIRLEY POPPIES, No. 34, 30gns.
 577 FLOWER PIECE, No. 35, 45gns.
 578 ROSES, No. 36, 35gns.; sold to Mrs Lew White.

Australian Academy of Art, July-August 1945:

- 579 WINTER SUNLIGHT, No. 20, 20gns.
 580 MOUNTAIN FOG, No. 26, 10gns.

Society of Artists, August 1945:

- 581 FLOWER PIECE, No. 42, 45gns.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1945:

- 582 FROSTY MORNING, No. 72, 15gns.
 583 FLOWER PIECE, No. 73, 20gns.
 584 GRASS, TREES AND BUSH, No. 74, 10gns.

585 THE TURN OF THE YEAR

1946

Oil on composite board, 57 x 39

Insc: Shore '46, lr.

Exh: TMP 1946, No. 84, 25gns.

Macq. 1947, No. 17, 35gns.

MBC 1949, No. 6, 30gns.

AGR 1957, No. 36, 60gns.

'Glimpses of the Forties', Heide Park and Art
 Gallery, 1982, No. 57.

Coll: Mrs Shore.

586 YELLOW DAHLIAS

1946

Oil, 58 x 48

Exh: Georges 1946, No. 2, 50gns.

Prov: Purchased by current owner through Georges Gallery,
 1948, 40gns. (SB); gift of The Zinc Corporation.

Coll: Broken Hill City Art Gallery.

587 NOON

1946

Oil on board, 39.2 x 27.9

Insc: Shore 46, lr.

Exh: Georges 1946, No. 13, 15gns.

Prov: B.R.Davies.

Acquired by current owner, 1979.

Coll: Bendigo Art Gallery.

- 588 SPRING AT MACEDON
1946
Oil on hardboard
Insc: Shore 46, lr.
Exh: CAG 1973, No. 11.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Shore, 1947,
for 40 guineas (SB).
Coll: Bendigo Art Gallery.
- 589 BUSH
1946
Oil on canvas, 62 x 51
Insc: Shore 46, lr.
Ill: MacGeorge, N., The Arts in Australia, 1948, p23.
FYSF.
Reed, J., Australian Landscape Painting, 1965, p15.
Exh: Georges 1946, No. 7, 40gns.
HGAG 1969, No. 7.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Georges 1946.
Coll: NGV.
- 590 BUSH OPAL
1946
Oil on paper on plywood, 38.1 x 56
Insc: Shore 46, lr.
Ill: Society of Artists Book, 1946-7, p62 (as 'Bush
Glade').
FYSF.
Exh: SSA 1946, No. 166, 40gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Shore, 1949,
for 25 guineas (SB).
Coll: Art Gallery of Western Australia.
- 591 SOFT SUNLIGHT
c.1946
Oil
Exh: Georges 1946, No. 17, 15gns.
Prov: Given by Shore to Ellerslie State School,
near Warrnambool, 1950 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 592 THE HILLSIDE
1946
Oil, c.27.5 x 37.5
Prov: Sold by Shore to University High School in 1946,
for 10 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 593 AFTER RAIN
c.1946
Oil, c.27.5 x 37.5
Exh: Georges 1946, No. 29, 20gns.
Prov: Purchased by Mrs Jackson from Georges 1946 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 594 FRUIT
c.1946
Oil, c.43 x 45
Exh: Georges 1946, No. 25, 20gns.
Prov: Purchased by A.B. Howie from Georges 1946, for
15 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.

Georges Gallery one-man exhibition, June 1946:

- 595 FLOWER PIECE, No. 3, 40gns.
 596 FLOWER PIECE, No. 5, 25gns.
 Also SSA 1946, No. 168, 25gns.
 597 DAHLIAS, No. 6, 40gns.
 Also Macq. 1947, No. 3, 40gns.
 598 DUCKS, No. 8, 40gns.
 Also SSA 1946, No. 164, 35gns.
 599 AUTUMN, No. 9, 25gns.
 Also SSA 1946, No. 169, 20gns.
 600 BUSH FRINGE, No. 11, 25gns.
 Also SSA 1946, No. 155, 25gns.
 Also AGR 1957, No. 35, 40gns.
 601 APPLE TREES, No. 12, 35gns.
 602 FIREWOOD, No. 14, 10gns.
 603 THE GLADE, No. 15, 15gns.
 604 THE DAM, No. 16, 10gns.
 605 VALLEY, No. 18, 10gns.
 606 WOODCHOPPER, No. 19, 10gns.
 607 SUMMER, No. 20, 12gns.
 608 COTTAGE, No. 21, 12gns.
 609 FARMYARD, No. 22, 12gns.
 610 WINDY DAY, No. 23, 10gns.
 611 MONTPELLIER, No. 24, 30gns.
 612 FARMYARD CORNER, No. 26, 20gns.
 613 APPLETIME, No. 27, 15gns. (sold)
 614 HEADREST AND FRUIT, No. 28, 15gns.
 615 CLEAR MORNING, No. 30, 15gns.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1946:

- 616 MACEDON ROAD, No. 85, 15gns.
 617 AUTUMN DAY, No. 86, 15gns.
 618 WASH DAY, No. 87, 15gns.
 619 BUSH FORMS
 1946
 Oil on canvas on cardboard, 37 x 27
 Insc: Shore 46, lr.
 Prov: Bill Millane.
 William Frater.
 Coll: Private collection, Newstead, Victoria.
 620 WINTER (NANDI)
 1946
 Oil
 Prov: Sold from Georges Gallery Christmas Exhibition,
 1949, to Mr Whight (?) Mont Albert, 10 guineas (SB).
 Whereabouts unknown.

- 621 TIMBLEBURY, MT. MACEDON
1946
Oil on board, 38 x 55
Insc: Shore 46, 11.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 622 PORTRAIT OF ALIGE HILL
1947
Oil on board, 59 x 48.8 (sight)
Insc: Shore 1947, 1r.
Prov: Given by Shore to the sitter, 1947. Frater also painted a portrait of Miss Hill at the same time. Both portraits are still in her possession.
Coll: Private collection, Dean, Victoria.
- 623 MILK SHED, NANDI
1947
Oil on cardboard, 20.3 x 29.3
Insc: Verso: To Gwen and Ken T. from A.S.
Sketch, "Nandi", Mt. Macedon, 1947
(in Shore's hand).
Prov: Given by Shore to current owner, 1949 (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 624 GREY GUMS, MT. MACEDON
1947
Oil
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 38, 60gns.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 625 "MORNING'S AT SEVEN"
1947
Oil on board, 55 x 36
Insc: Shore 47, 1r.
Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, Spring 1980, No. 115.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 37, 60gns.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 626 FRENCH'S FOREST, N.S.W.
1947
Oil
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 91, 100gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 8.
Prov: Tristan Buesst.
Ref: John Brack's review of the AGR exhibition, Age, July 23, 1957, in which this work is described, and adjudged the best in the exhibition.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 627 CHOOKS, MT. MACEDON
1947
Oil on canvas, 33.3 x 46
Insc: Shore 47, 1r.
Verso: Chooks, Mt. Macedon.
Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, September 1981, p116.
Exh: Macq. 1947, No. 20, 20gns.
Prov: Joseph Brown, September 1981.
Coll: Private collection.

- 628 BACK PADDOCK, NANDI
c.1947
Oil
Prov: Sold by Shore to Mr F.Gowers, Macedon, 1947,
for £3 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 629 FIREWOOD IN BUSH
c.1947
Pastel
Prov: Sold by Shore to Mr F.Gowers, Macedon, 1947,
for £3 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 630 RHODODENDRONS
c.1947
Oil, c.75 x 62
Exh: Macq. 1947, No. 2, 40gns.
Prov: Purchased by Mrs Murray Jones from Macq. 1947 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 631 WHITE GUM AND BANKSIA
1947
Oil
Exh: Macq. 1947, No. 6, 35gns.
MBC 1949, No. 14, 30gns.
AGR 1957, No. 39, 40gns.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 632 BUSH, N.S.W.
1947 (May)
Oil on canvas, 50.7 x 61.5
Insc: Shore 47, lr.
Exh: Macq. 1947, No. 4, 40gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Macq. 1947.
Ref: Smith, B., Catalogue of Australian Oil Paintings
in the National Art Gallery of N.S.W. 1876-1952.
Coll: AGNSW.
- 633 ANGOPHORA TREE
1947
Oil (wax medium) on board, 37.5 x 26.3
Insc: Shore 47, ll.
Verso: Angophora Tree 15gns.
Turrumurra NSW Arnold Shore 47
Exh: Macq. 1947, No. 8, 15gns.
AGR 1957, No. 40.
Prov: Given by Shore to Joan Lindsay, 1949.
Joel's, November 1978, lot 251; unsold, but later
sold to current owner.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 634 NEAR BOBBIN HEAD
1947
Pastel, 25.1 x 31 (image)
Insc: Shore 47, lr.
Verso: Near Bobbin Head, N.S.W., 1947
Pastel 20gns. Arnold Shore.
Exh: AGR, No. 41, 30gns.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 635 COWAN CREEK
1947
Oil
Exh: Macq. 1947, No. 12, 35gns.
MBC 1949 (as 'Cavan Creek'), No. 16, 30gns.
Prov: Given to Mrs Ethel Barnes, November 1949 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 636 THE LITTLE HILL (WAHROONGA N.S.W.)
1947
Oil on board, 36 x 45
Insc: Shore 47, lr.
Exh: Macq. 1947, No. 9, 25gns. (as 'A Little Hill')
CAG 1973, No. 12.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

Macquarie Galleries one-man exhibition, June 1947:

- 637 CANNAS, No. 1, 60gns.
- 638 WILD COUNTRY, N.S.W., No. 5, 40gns.
Also MBC 1949, No. 13, 40gns.
- 639 "OUR" CREEK, No. 7, 45gns.; sold to Mrs Murray Jones,
exchanged later for 'Rhododendrons'.
- 640 BANNOCKBURN ROAD, TURRAMURRA, No. 10, 20gns.
- 641 CHINESE EFFECT, No. 11, 15gns.
- 642 WATERFALL, TURRAMURRA, No. 13, 15gns.
- 643 THE DIVIDING RANGE, VICTORIA, No. 14, 15gns.
- 644 GREEN SPRING, No. 16, 40gns.
- 645 GREY BUSH, No. 18, 30gns.
Also MBC 1949, No. 11, 20gns.
- 646 THE LEE OF THE CYPRUS, No. 19, 35gns.
- 647 MORNING, MT. TOWRONG, No. 22, 35gns.
- 648 VEGETABLE GARDEN, "NANDI", No. 23, 20gns.
- 649 SPRING, MT. MACEDON, No. 24, 15gns.; sold to
B.J. Waterhouse (SB).
- 650 BUSH ROAD, MT. MACEDON, No. 25, 15gns.
- 651 THE COWBAIL, No. 26, 15gns.

NO WORK COMPLETED IN 1948

- 652 OLD WORKINGS, BROKEN HILL
1949
Pastel, crayon and watercolour, 24.8 x 34.3
Insc: Shore 49, ll.
Exh: MBC 1949, No. 24, 15gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from MBC 1949.
Coll: NGV.

- 653 OLD WORKINGS, BROKEN HILL
 1949
 Crayon, 19.7 x 28.7 (image)
 Insc: Shore 49, 11.
 Exh: AGR 1957, No. 47, 20gns.
 PSG 1977, No. 50.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 654 HOTEL, BROKEN HILL
 1949
 Pastel, 24.3 x 34.3
 Insc: Shore 49, 1r.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 655 IN THE CAGE (BROKEN HILL)
 1949
 Pen, ink and crayon, 24.2 x 19.7
 Insc: Shore 49, 1r.
 Exh: MBC 1949, No. 21, 10gns.
 AGR 1957, No. 45, 30gns.
 CAG 1973, No. 33.
 PSG 1977, No. 51.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 656 THE SIXTEENTH LEVEL, BROKEN HILL
 1949
 Crayon.
 Exh: MBC 1949, No. 22, 10gns.
 AGR 1957, No. 44, 15gns.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 657 A MILE AND MORE BELOW, BROKEN HILL
 1949
 Crayon, 19.6 x 30.5
 Exh: AGR 1957, No. 46, 15gns.
 PSG 1977, No. 49.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 658 MRS STORMONT: READING THE PAPER
 1949
 Pen and ink, 17.5 x 12 (image)
 Insc: Shore '49, 1r.
 Verso: See Cat. no. 659.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 659 MRS STORMONT: ASLEEP
 1949
 Pen and ink, 17.5 x 12 (image)
 Insc: Shore '49, 1r.
 Verso: This and the previous catalogue entry are
 framed together as a pair. The reverse
 carries the inscription:
 "Reading the Paper" and "Asleep"
 Drgs of Mrs Herbert Stormont, "Wattle Lodge"
 Springvale Rd., Springvale 1949
 Arnold Shore 30 guineas.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 660 ORCHARD, NANDI
 1949 (February)
 Oil on board, 27.5 x 37.5
 Insc: Shore 49 (?), 11.
 Verso: To Bill Oliver 3.3.1949
 Souvenir of our Saturday 26.2.47 (?)
 a lovely day.
 Prov: Given by Shore to Bill Oliver, 1949.
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 661 BLACK CHARLIE'S LAGOON
 1949 (June)
 Oil on canvas, 29.6 x 39.1
 Insc: Shore, lr.
 Exh: VAS, 'An Exhibition of Present Day Art of Victoria',
 November-December 1951, No. 24.
 AGR 1957, No. 43.
 Prov: A note in the Sales book reads: "Oil sketch
 Black Charlie's Lagoon Turrumburry, Vic. Bought
 by Bill Oliver just after painted 12.6.49, £12."
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 662 DAWN, JEPARIT
 1949
 Oil on canvas, 38 x 46
 Insc: Shore 49, lr.
 Exh: MBC 1949, No. 17, 30gns. (as 'Sunrise, Jeparit').
 AGR 1957, No. 42, 50gns.
 Prov: Mrs Shore, until sold by her through Joseph Brown,
 1982.
 Coll: Private collection.
- 663 NEAR YAN YEAN
 1949
 Oil, c.60 x 50
 Exh: AGR 1957, No. 49.
 Prov: Given by Shore to Bill Millane, in return for
 light fittings, October 1952 (SB).
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 664 SKETCH: ARTHUR'S CREEK
 c.1949
 Oil, c.22 x 12
 Prov: Given by Shore to Clive Turnbull, December 1949
 (SB).
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 665 THE NEW ORCHARD
 1949
 Oil on canvas, 35.2 x 40.9
 Insc: Shore 49, lr.
 Verso: The New Orchard 1949 Arnold Shore.
 Exh: AGR 1957, No. 50, 50gns.
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 666 THE STORE, SMITH'S CREEK
 1949
 Oil on board, 26.5 x 32.2 (sight)
 Insc: Shore 49, lr.
 Verso: The Store, Smith's Creek Arnold Shore.
 Exh: AGR 1957, No. 49, 40gns.
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

- 667 NEAR THE COBAW RANGES
1949
Oil
Prov: Given by Shore to current owner, 1957.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 668 THE OLD STABLE, NANDI
1949 (?)
Oil on canvas, 65.5 x 92.5
Insc: Shore 49, lr.
Exh: Georges 1946, No. 1, 100gns. (?)
Prov: The title, size and price suggest that this work was exhibited in 1946, then re-worked and re-dated in 1949.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 669 VEGETABLE FLOWER PIECE
1946-9
Oil on canvas, 76 x 63
Insc: Shore 49, lr.
Exh: MBC 1949, No. 15, 40gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 9.
Prov: The Sales book records that this work was painted at Nandi about 1946 and repainted in East Melbourne in 1949. It was sold to Melbourne Teachers' College in 1950, for 30 guineas.
Coll: State College of Victoria, Melbourne.
- 670 DAHLIAS
1946-9
Oil, c.60 x 50
Exh: Georges 1946, No. 6, 40gns. (?)
Macq. 1947, No. 3, 40gns. (?)
(If this work was so exhibited, it can be identified with Cat. no. 597.)
Prov: Painted at Nandi 1946; repainted at East Melbourne, 1949. Purchased by current owner, 1949, for 30 guineas by special arrangement (SB, 1949).
Coll: Adelaide Teachers' Training College.
- 671 BUSH (ARTHUR'S CREEK)
1949 (November)
Oil, c.60 x 50
Prov: Purchased from Shore by Mr and Mrs Roger Evans, Leicester, England, December 1949, 30 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection, England.
- 672 THE INDICATION OF THE LODGE
1949
Pastel (?)
Prov: Given by Shore to Mr and Mrs Roger Evans, Leicester, England, 1949.
Coll: Private collection, England.
- 673 THE OPEN CUT, BROKEN HILL
1949
Pastel
Prov: Sold by Shore, December 1949, 10 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.

Melbourne Book Club Gallery one-man exhibition, September-October, 1949. MBC catalogue numbers 1 to 18 are oils.

- 674 PINK AND BLUE, No. 1, 50gns.
 675 TREES, MACEDON, No. 2, 15gns.
 676 TOWARDS BULLENGAROOK, No. 3, 15gns.
 677 STILL LIFE, No. 4, 40gns.
 678 MURRAY COUNTRY, No. 5, 20gns.
 679 ROADSIDE GUMS, No. 7, 20gns.
 680 HILL COUNTRY, VICTORIA, No. 8, 20gns.
 681 SUMMER FLOWER PIECE, No. 9, 40gns.
 682 SPRING FLOWER PIECE, No. 10, 40gns.
 683 SUMMER, MT. TOWRONG, No. 12, 50gns.
 684 EAST MELBOURNE, No. 18, 20gns.
 685 MT. DIOGENES, WOODEND, Watercolour, No. 19, 15gns.
 686 THE SHANTY, ARTHUR'S CREEK, Watercolour, No. 20, 10gns.
 687 BUSH AT TURRAMURRA, Watercolour, 1947, No. 23, 10gns.
 Sold to Dennis Mirams.
 Also AGR 1957, No. 48.
- 688 AVOCA HOUSE, SOUTH YARRA
 1950
 Oil on composite board, 34.6 x 39.5 (sight)
 Insc: Verso: Avoca House South Yarra
 Arnold Shore 1950 30gns.
 Prov: Sold by Shore to current owner, 1950, for 28
 guineas (SB).
 Coll: Fern Tree Gully Arts Society.
- 689 AUTUMN, MT. MACEDON
 1950
 Oil on canvas, 49.5 x 60 (sight)
 Insc: Shore 50, 1r.
 Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 10.
 CAG 1973, No. 13.
 Prov: Given to current owner (Shore's brother-in-law)
 as a birthday present, October 1950 (SB).
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 690 LANDSCAPE, MT. MACEDON
 1950
 Oil, 51 x 62.5
 Exh: TMP 1950, No. 69, 60gns.
 PSG 1977, No. 2.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 691 OVER TO MACEDON
 c.1950
 Oil
 Prov: Sold from Stanley Coe Gallery first exhibition,
 March 1950, 50gns.
 Whereabouts unknown.

Twenty Melbourne Painters, September 1950:

- 692 LANDSCAPE: ARTHUR'S CREEK, No. 70, 25gns.
- 693 WHITE HIBISCUS
1951
Oil (wax medium) on canvas, 50.2 x 60.5
Insc: Shore 51, lr.
Exh: VAS Autumn, 1951, 40gns. (?)
CAG 1973, No. 14.
Prov: Painted at Pine Lodge flat, Hawthorn.
Purchased by current owner from VAS, 1951.
Coll: Castlemaine Art Gallery.
- 694 ROSES
c.1951
Oil
Prov: Sold to Mr and Mrs Wright from Stanley Coe Gallery,
July 1951, for 40 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 695 OLD FARM, SOUTH MORANG
1951
Oil on canvas, 44 x 62
Insc: Shore 51, lr.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 54, 60gns.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 696 OLD RED GUMS
1951
Watercolour
Exh: SSA (Autumn) 1952, No. 65, 15gns.
Prov: Painted near Eden Park, 1951.
Sold from SSA (Autumn) 1952 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 697 PASTORALE
1951 (December)
Oil on composite board, 33.3 x 41.9
Insc: Shore 51, lr.
Verso: "Pastorale" 1951 Arnold Shore
Prov: Purchased by Madame Teresa Vigano from Stanley
Coe Gallery, May 1952, for 35 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- Works dated 1951 exhibited AGR 1957:
- 698 FROM COPPIN'S GROVE, HAWTHORN, No. 52, 20gns.
(Presumably Coppin Grove)
- 699 THE ROAD, SMITH'S GULLY, No. 53, 50gns.
- 700 CHRYSTOBEL CRESCENT
1952
Oil on canvas, 45 x 56
Insc: Shore 52, lr.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 56, 80gns.
PSG 1977, No. 37 (incorrectly dated 1962).
Prov: Some restoration work to secure lifting paint was
carried out at the Joseph Brown Gallery, 1982.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 701 PEAS AND PODDIES
c.1952
Oil
Exh: VAS (Spring) 1952, No. 123, 25gns.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 702 SEA CLIFFS
c.1952
Watercolour
Insc: Shore, 1l.
Exh: SSA 1952, No. 68, 20gns.
Coll: Private collection, U.S.A.
- 703 NEAR CAPE PATERSON
1952
Watercolour, 24.8 x 34.8
Exh: CAG 1973, No. 34.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 704 TREES (NEAR WHITTLESEA)
1952
Oil on canvas on board, 27 x 19
Insc: Shore 52, 1r.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from VAS Bargain sale,
March 1953, 3 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 705 (RURAL LANDSCAPE)
1952
Oil on canvas on board, 24.5 x 29.5 (sight)
Insc: Shore 52, 1l.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 706 WATTLE GOLD
1952
Oil on cardboard, 26.6 x 37
Insc: Shore 52, 1l.
Verso: "Silver Wattle" Arnold Shore
No. 55 Wattle Gold 1952 Arnold Shore
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 55, 40gns.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 707 FLOWERPIECE
1952
Oil, c.60 x 50
Exh: VAS, Spring 1952 (?)
HCAG 1969, No. 12.
Prov: Purchased by current owner through Laurie
Pendlebury, 1953, for 60 guineas (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 708 STORM
1952
Watercolour
Exh: SSA 1952, No. 66, 10gns.
Prov: Painted at Eden Park, 1952.
Given by Shore to Judge Dunn, Camberwell, 1953 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.

- 709 NEAR FLOWERDALE
1952
Oil on canvas, 45.7 x 38.1
Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 11.
Prov: Given by Shore to current owner, March 1952,
"in gratitude for his treatment of self." (SB)
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 710 SUMMER AT MARIO'S
c.1952
Watercolour
Prov: Given by Shore to Allan Lowe in exchange for a
Doveton pot, November 1952 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 711 STORMY LANDSCAPE
1952
Watercolour, 24.1 x 34.9
Insc: Shore '52, lr.
Exh: VAS (Spring) 1952, No. 137, 25gns.
Prov: Painted at Eden Park (the work is entitled
'Eden Park' in the Sales book).
Purchased by current owner from VAS 1952.
Coll: NGV.
- 712 EDEN PARK
c.1952
Watercolour
Prov: Sold through George Page Cooper to Charles
Woodford, May 1952, for £10 (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 713 STORM AT EDEN PARK
1952
Watercolour, c.25 x 35
Prov: Given by Shore to current owner, Christmas 1952.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- Society of Artists, May 1952:
- 714 LANDSCAPE, Watercolour, No. 67, 20gns.
Works dated 1952 exhibited AGR 1957:
- 715 NORTH WIND, No. 57, 30gns.
716 ARTHUR'S CREEK, No. 58, 80gns.
717 GUMS, SOUTH MORANG, No. 59, 80gns.
718 CLIFF AT INVERLOCH, No. 92, 30gns.
- 719 FLOWERPIECE
1953
Oil on canvas, 73 x 60.5
Insc: Shore 53, ll.
Exh: VAS (Spring) 1953, No. 23, 120gns.
Prov: Sold by Shore to current owner in 1957 together
with Cat. no. 750 for £110 the two (SB).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

- 720 NEAR KINGLAKE
1953
Watercolour and charcoal, 24.8 x 34.3
Insc: Shore '53
Exh: VAS Drawings and watercolours exhibition, 1953,
No. 25, 30gns.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from VAS 1953.
Coll: NGV.
- 721 LANDSCAPE
1953
Crayon and watercolour, 34.5 x 24.5 (image)
Insc: Shore 1953, ll.
Coll: Private collection, Sydney.
- Victorian Artists' Society (Autumn) 1953:
- 722 FLOWERPIECE, oil, No. 34, 60gns.
- Society of Artists, August-September 1953:
- 723 FLOWERPIECE, oil, No. 11, 30gns.
Also TMP 1953, No. 60, 30gns. (?)
- Works dated 1954 exhibited AGR 1957:
- 724 FARM CORNER, No. 61, 20gns.
725 NEAR KANGAROO GROUNDS, No. 62, 40gns.
726 HAYSTACKS, No. 63, 20gns.
727 COLOUR NOTE (1954-5), No. 60, 20gns.
- Works dated 1955 exhibited AGR 1957:
- 728 GERANIUM AND LAUREL, No. 64, 30gns.
729 TOWARDS KINGLAKE, No. 66, 40gns.
- 730 SOUTH MORANG
1955-6
Crayon and watercolour, 33.5 x 23.2 (image)
Insc: Shore 56, ll.
Verso: South Morang, Vic. 1955 30gns. Arnold
Shore.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 67, 30gns. (dated 1955)
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 731 SOUTH MORANG
1956
Watercolour, 24 x 34 (image)
Insc: Shore 56, lr.
Exh: CAG 1973, No. 35.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 732 LANDSCAPE
1956
Watercolour and crayon, 25.5 x 35.5
Insc: Shore 56, ll.
Coll: Castlemaine Art Gallery.

- 733 HAYSTACKS
1956
Oil on canvas, 37 x 45
Insc: Shore 56, lr.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 734 SERPELL'S ROAD, TEMPLESTOWE
1956
Watercolour, c.22 x 30 (image)
Insc: Shore 56, lr.
Prov: Given by Shore to Bill Oliver, 1956.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- Works dated 1956 exhibited AGR 1957:
- 735 EROSION, No. 65, 30gns.
736 SMALL POOL, TEMPLESTOWE, No. 68, 25gns.
737 PINES AT MARIO'S, No. 69, 30gns.
738 EDEN PARK, No. 70, 30gns.
739 SCoured EARTH, No. 71, 30gns.
740 SERPELL'S ROAD, TEMPLESTOWE, No. 72, 30gns.
741 TEMPLESTOWE, No. 73, 30gns.
742 GUMS AND HILLS, No. 74, 30gns.
743 BUSH ROAD, No. 75, 30gns.
- 744 STRINGYS AND MESSMATE (NEAR AIREY'S INLET)
1957
Oil on composite board, 40.6 x 30.2
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, Winter 1977.
Exh: MGB 1960, No. 8, 45gns.
Prov: Presented to current owner by Joseph Brown, 1977.
Coll: University of Melbourne.
- 745 CLIFF FACE, JERUSALEM BAY
1957
Oil on composite board, 37 x 27
Insc: Shore 57, ll
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 89, 60gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 13.
PSG 1977, No. 5.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 746 AIREY'S INLET
1957
Oil on board, 32 x 37
Insc: Shore '57, lr.
Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, September 1981, p116.
Exh: VAS (Autumn) 1963, No. 112, 50gns.
Prov: Joel's, May 1981, lot 1602; sold \$1400.
Joseph Brown, September 1981.
Coll: Private collection.

- 747 GUM TREE STUDY
1957
Watercolour, 40.5 x 53
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 52.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 748 (TREE STUDY)
c.1957 (?)
Oil on composite board, 40 x 23
Unsigned.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 749 CORNER AT AIREY'S INLET
1957
Oil on canvas on board, 29 x 18
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 750 FLOWERPIECE
1957
Oil on canvas, 50.2 x 45.1
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Prov: Sold by Shore to current owner together with
Cat. no. 719, 1957.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 751 BUSH, SMITH'S CREEK
1957
Oil on composite board, 37.3 x 27.8
Insc: Shore 57, ll.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 88, 60gns.
CAG 1973, No. 17.
PSG 1977, No. 6.
Prov: Purchased by Mrs Shore, without Shore's knowledge,
from AGR 1957.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 752 MOUNTAIN ASH FOREST
1957
Oil on composite board, 44 x 29
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Verso: Mountain Ash Forest
Dividing Range, nr. Whittlesea.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 93, 50gns.
PSG 1977, No. 4.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 753 DIAMOND CREEK
1957
Oil on canvas, 44.3 x 61.3
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Ill: PSG 1977 catalogue.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 77, 80gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 15.
CAG 1973, No. 16.
PSG 1977, No. 3.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 754 WHEELER'S HILL
c.1957
Oil
Prov: Sold through Ian Purves to the American Consul,
1957, 45 guineas (SB).
Whereabouts unknown.
- 755 HAWKESBURY BRIDGE (?)
1957
Oil on canvas on board, 14.5 x 25
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Exh: AGR 1957, No. 81, 20gns. (?)
Prov: Kathleen Hay estate.
Coll: Castlemaine Art Gallery.
- 756 AIREY'S INLET (LIGHTHOUSE)
1957
Watercolour, 24 x 34 (image)
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 757 IRONBARKS, AIREY'S INLET
1957
Watercolour (?)
Exh: VAS Drawing and Graphic Art exhibition, July 1957,
No. 35, 30gns.
AGR 1957, No. 96, 30gns.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 758 SELF PORTRAIT
c.1957
Drawing (?)
Exh: VAS Drawing and Graphic Art exhibition, July 1957,
No. 33, 25gns.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 759 SMITH'S CREEK
1957
Oil
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 30, 40gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 16.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 760 BUSH ROAD, CHRISTMAS HILLS
1957
Oil on canvas, c.81 x 134
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Ill: Art and Australia, March 1980, p268.
Prov: Entered for McCaughey Prize competition 1957,
but rejected for exceeding the maximum dimensions.
Selected by Daryl Lindsay for presentation to the
Queen Mother, February 1958.
Coll: Royal collections, England.
- 761 BILL MORPHETT
1957
Pen and ink, 24.5 x 18.5
Insc: Shore '57, lr.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 762 THE BLIND ARTIST (ALICE PANTON)
1957
Pen and ink, 24.6 x 18 (image)
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Prov: Preliminary study for the commissioned portrait,
Cat. no. 763.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 763 PORTRAIT OF A BLIND ARTIST: ALICE PANTON
1957
Oil on canvas, 101.6 x 76.8
Insc: Shore 57, lr.
Verso: Alice Panton artist daughter of J.A.Panton
C.M.G. Goldfields commissioner Vic.,
first police magistrate of Melbourne.
Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, September 1981, pl17.
Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 17.
CAG 1973, No. 18.
Prov: Mr L.Muir.
Joseph Brown, September 1981.
Coll: Private collection.
- Victorian Artists' Society (Spring) 1957:
764 QUARTETTE, No. 120, 30gns.
- Victorian Artists' Society, November 1957:
765 ROAD AT AIREY'S INLET, No. 50, 50gns.
766 VIGOUR, No. 79, 40gns.
- Works dated 1957 exhibited AGR 1957:
767 TREES, PLANTS AND A HOUSE, Crayon, No. 76, 25gns.
768 OLD HOUSE, No. 78, 30gns.
769 TORQUAY, No. 79, 30gns.
770 OIL SKETCH, KANGAROO GROUNDS, No. 80, 25gns.
771 EAGLE ROCK, Pastel, No. 82, 25gns.
772 AIREY'S INLET COAST, No. 83, 30gns.
773 THE LAGOON, Crayon, No. 84, 30gns.
774 GUMS, AIREY'S INLET, No. 85, 20gns.
775 BROOKLYN, N.S.W., No. 86, 30gns.
776 WISEMAN'S FERRY, Crayon, No. 87, 20gns.
777 KANGAROO GROUNDS, SKETCH, No. 90, 40gns.
778 CLIFF AT COWAN CREEK, N.S.W., Pen drawing, No. 94, 35gns.
779 SELF PORTRAIT: ON AN UNEVEN KEEL, COWAN CLIFF, N.S.W.,
Pen drawing, No. 95, 25gns.
780 MOUNTAINSIDE, No. 97, 60gns.

- 781 MESSMATE SCRUB
1958
Oil on composite board, 30 x 40
Insc: Shore 58, lr.
Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 18.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 782 PATH THROUGH THE TREES, FLINDERS
1958
Oil on composite board, 30.4 x 39.4
Insc: Shore 58, lr.
Ill: PSG 1977 catalogue.
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 9.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 783 NEAR KILMORE
1958
Oil on hardboard, 43.9 x 33
Insc: Shore 58, lr.
Exh: Newcastle City Art Festival, June 1959.
Prov: Purchased by current owner from Newcastle City
Art Festival exhibition, June 1959.
Coll: Newcastle Region Art Gallery.
- 784 (PADDOCK OF GUMS)
1958
Oil on composite board, 25 x 31
Insc: Shore 58, lr.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 785 RED GUM PADDOCK
(c.1958)
Oil on composite board, 32.1 x 41.2
Unsigned, undated.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 31, 60gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 22 (dated 1961)
CAG 1973, No. 21 (dated 1961)
(The suggested dating of c.1958 is based on
stylistic similarities with other works of 1958.)
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 786 ANGLESEA CLIFFS
1958
Oil on canvas, 50.5 x 61.2
Insc: Shore 58, lr.
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 46.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 787 THE BACKYARDS
1958
Oil on canvas, 124 x 124
Insc: Shore 58, lr.
Prov: Painted over a Rupert Bunny canvas.
Coll: Australian National University, Canberra.
- 788 AT FLINDERS
1958
Oil on composite board, 28 x 37.5
Insc: Shore 58, lr.
Coll: Private collection, Sydney.

- 789 FLINDERS
 (1958)
 Oil on composite board, 24 x 34
 Unsigned, undated.
 Exh: VAS (Spring) 1958, No. 35, 50gns.
 VAS solo 1962, No. 29, 40gns.
 PSG 1977, No. 42.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 790 PENTLAND HILLS
 1958
 Oil on composite board, 51 x 61 (sight)
 Insc: Shore 58, lr.
 Prov: Painted in the company of Len Annois.
 Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, December 1976.
 Coll: Victorian College of Pharmacy.
- 791 BACCHUS MARSH
 1958
 Oil on cardboard, 27 x 37
 Exh: MGB 1960, No. 5, 40gns.
 Prov: Painted in the company of Len Annois.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 792 SMITH'S CREEK (IN THE RAIN)
 1958
 Oil on composite board, 23.1 x 40.2
 Insc: Shore 58, lr.
 Ill: PSG 1977 catalogue.
 Exh: VAS Gum Tree Exhibition, July 1959, No. 77, 50gns.
 PSG 1977, No. 7.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 793 TEA TREE, FLINDERS
 1958
 Oil, 19.5 x 32.5
 Exh: PSG 1977, No. 10.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 794 EDEN PARK
 1958
 Watercolour, 23.6 x 33.5
 Exh: CAG 1973, No. 36.
 PSG 1977, No. 53.
 Whereabouts unknown.
- 795 CLONBINANE TRACK
 1958
 Oil on composite board, 33 x 23
 Insc: Shore 58, ll.
 Exh: MGB 1960, No. 26, 30gns.
 PSG 1977, No. 8.
 Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, 1982.
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 796 DRY GRASS Paddock
 1958
 Oil on composite board, 24.5 x 34.5
 Insc: Shore 58, lr.
 Exh: CAG 1973, No. 19.
 PSG 1977, No. 11.
 Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, June 1974.
 Coll: Castlemaine Art Gallery.

- 797 NEAR WHITTLESEA
1958
Oil on composite board, 32 x 41.5
Insc: Shore 58, lr.
Exh: VAS (Spring) 1959, No. 32, 60gns.
MGB 1960 (as 'Whittlesea'), No. 3, 60gns.
VAS solo 1962 (as 'Whittlesea'), No. 39, 60gns.
Prov: Given by Mrs Shore to current owners as a
wedding present, December 1963.
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- Victorian Artists' Society (Spring) 1958:
- 798 FLOWERS IN A ROOM, No. 124, 50gns.
- 799 FOREST GUMS, FLOWERDALE
1959
Oil on composite board, 59.6 x 50.1
Insc: Shore 1959, lr.
Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, November 1974.
Coll: Benalla Art Gallery (Ledger Collection).
- 800 GUM BLOSSOMS
1959
Oil on canvas on composite board, 96.1 x 83.3
Insc: Shore 59, lr.
Verso: Gum Blossoms Arnold Shore
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 3, 400gns.
PSG 1977, No. 15.
Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, October 1969.
Coll: ANG.
- 801 NORTH WEST VICTORIA
1959
Oil on composite board, 74.2 x 54
Insc: Shore, 11; Shore 1959, lr.
Exh: VAS Gum Tree Exhibition, July 1959, No. 72, 150gns.
Coll: Private collection, Sydney.
- 802 CANDLEBARKS
1959
Oil
Exh: MGB 1960, No. 24, 35gns.
VAS solo 1962, No. 35, 30gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 21.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 803 FACTORY NEAR RIVER
1959 (?)
Oil on composite board, 23.1 x 40.7
Unsigned, undated.
Exh: MGB 1960, No. 18, 35gns.
VAS solo 1962, No. 42, 50gns.
PSG 1977, No. 13.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 804 SIDE ROAD AT FLINDERS
1959
Oil on composite board, 45.7 x 59.6
Insc: Shore 59, lr.
Exh: MGB 1960, No. 6, 100gns. (sold)
Prov: Joseph Brown, Spring 1976.
Presented by Joseph Brown to current owner.
Coll: University of Melbourne.
- 805 NEAR THE YARRA, KEW
1959
Oil, 31.3 x 40.1
Exh: MGB 1960, No. 13, 50gns.
PSG 1977, No. 12.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 806 BUSH ABSTRACT
c.1959
Oil
Exh: VAS Gum Tree Exhibition, July 1959, No. 23, 100gns.
VAS solo 1962, No. 14, 150gns.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 807 SUMMER RAIN
1959
Oil on plywood, 33.4 x 42.5
Insc: Shore 59, lr.
Exh: MGB 1960, No. 9, 50gns.
VAS solo 1962, No. 28, 50gns.
Coll: Private collection, Sydney.
- 808 SEASIDE BUSH
1959
Oil, 31.5 x 39.5
Exh: MGB 1960 (as 'Seaside Gums'), No. 27, 45gns.
VAS solo 1962, No. 23, 40gns.
PSG 1977, No. 14.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 809 KINGLAKE
c.1959
Oil on composite board, 24 x 40
Unsigned, undated.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 810 WILD DOG CREEK
1959
Oil on canvas on board, 30.3 x 38.9
Insc: Verso: Wild Dog Creek.
Exh: MGB 1960, No. 4, 60gns.
VAS solo 1962, No. 43, 60gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 19.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 811 EVENING LIGHT
1959
Oil on composite board, 24 x 34
Insc: Shore 59, ll.
Exh: MGB 1960, No. 23, 30gns.
VAS solo 1962, No. 25, 30gns.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 812 (CLUMP OF TREES)
1959
Oil on canvas, 59 x 48
Insc: Shore 59, 11.
Coll: Victoria College, Burwood.
- 813 SKETCH FOR 'IDEAL LANDSCAPE'
1959
Pencil, c.22.5 x 27.5 (image)
Insc: Shore 59, 1r.
Exh: 'Maria Teresa Vignano' exhibition, Victorian
College of the Arts, June 1981 (uncatalogued).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 814 IDEAL LANDSCAPE
1959
Cloth collage, metallic thread and paint on heavy
cotton, 205 x 504
Insc: Shore 1959, 11.
Ill: Finemore, B., Freedom From Prejudice, NGV, 1977, p78.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, uncatalogued.
Prov: Commissioned by Madame Vignano for Mario's
Restaurant, Melbourne.
Purchased by current owner from the estate of
Madame Vignano, 1971.
Coll: NGV.
- 815 SPRING
1960
Oil on composite board, 31.5 x 42.5
Insc: Shore 60, 11.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 45, 70gns.
CAG 1973, No. 20 (incorrectly dated 1940).
PSG 1977, No. 16.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 816 BUSH COAST
1960
Oil on board, 59 x 49
Insc: Shore 1960, 1r.
Ill: Joseph Brown catalogue, Autumn 1975, No. 49.
Exh: VAS solo 1962 (as 'Coast Bush'), No. 16, 250gns.
Prov: Mrs Shore.
Joseph Brown, Autumn 1975.
Coll: Private collection.
- 817 THE RED ROOF, FLINDERS
1960 (?)
Oil on composite board, 28.2 x 31.5
Unsigned, undated.
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 17.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

Moreton Galleries, Brisbane, one-man exhibition,
May-June 1960:

- 818 THE BLACK STUMP, No. 1, 100gns.
 819 SUMMER, No. 2, 100gns.
 820 FLOWERDALE, No. 7, 60gns.
 821 EDEN PARK, No. 10, 50gns.
 Also VAS solo 1962, No. 40, 50gns.
 822 WINTER AFTERNOON, No. 12, 50gns. (sold)
 823 CHRISTMAS HILLS, No. 14, 45gns. (sold)
 824 BASS STRAIT, No. 15, 45gns.
 825 ROADSIDE, KINGLAKE, No. 16, 35gns.
 826 GUMS, No. 17, 35gns.
 827 SUMMER, No. 19, 30gns.; retained in Brisbane and later
 sold there.
 828 GUMS, CLONBINANE, No. 20, 35gns. (sold)
 829 OLD WARRIOR, No. 21, 40gns.
 830 OLD STUMP, No. 22, 40gns.
 831 BUSH ROAD, No. 25, 35gns.
 832 RAIN, CLONBINANE, No. 28, 60gns.
 Also VAS solo 1962 (as 'Rain'), No. 27, 60gns.
 833 COUNTRY TRACK
 1961
 Oil on composite board, 24.1 x 39.4
 Insc: Shore 61, 11.
 Exh: PSG 1977, No. 44.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
 834 ROAD TO KINGLAKE
 1961
 Oil, 32.2 x 19.1
 Exh: VAS solo 1962 (as 'Road, Kinglake'), No. 18, 30gns.
 CAG 1973, No. 23.
 Whereabouts unknown.
 835 TRACK, KANGAROO GROUND
 1961
 Oil, 41.4 x 32.6
 Exh: CAG 1973, No. 22.
 Whereabouts unknown.
 836 STORM AT AIREY'S INLET
 1962
 Oil on canvas on board, 30.4 x 39.2 (sight)
 Insc: Verso: "Storm at Airey's Inlet"
 1962 Arnold Shore
 Coll: Private collection, Dean, Victoria.

- 837 BUSH, PLENTY RIVER
1962
Oil on composite board, 59.5 x 50
Insc: Shore 62, lr.
Ill: PSG 1977 catalogue.
Exh: CAG 1973, No. 29.
PSG 1977, No. 18.
Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, 1979.
Coll: Victoria College, Toorak.
- 838 VEGETABLE GARDEN IN RAIN (SOUTH MORANG)
c.1962
Oil on composite board, 69.5 x 59.2
Unsigned, undated.
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 20.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 839 (THE SIDEBOARD)
1962
Oil on canvas, 85 x 119
Insc: Shore 62, lr.
Exh: VAS solo 1962 (as 'Still Life'), No. 5, 300gns.
Prov: Painted on the reverse of a Rupert Bunny canvas.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 840 BACK GARDEN
1962
Oil on canvas, 120 x 120
Insc: Shore 62, lr.
Ill: McCulloch, A., Encyclopaedia of Australian Art,
1977, p624 (as 'The Garden').
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 4, 350gns.
CAG 1973, No. 15.
PSG 1977, No. 31.
Prov: Painted on the reverse of a Rupert Bunny canvas.
Joseph Brown, Winter 1974 (unsold).
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 841 QUINCES AND FOLIAGE (IN A WHITE JUG)
1962
Oil on composite board, 76 x 62.8
Unsigned.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 12, 200gns. } as
HCAG 1969, No. 26. } 'Young Quinces'
CAG 1973, No. 25.
PSG 1977, No. 28
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 842 SELF PORTRAIT
1962
Oil on composite board, 97.5 x 80
Insc: Shore 62, ll.
Ill: PSG 1977 catalogue.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 1, 1000gns.
VAS Self Portrait Exhibition, July 1962, No. 59,
1000gns.
SSA 1963, No. 61.
PSG 1977, No. 39.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 843 MINE NEAR ANGLESEA
1962
Oil on canvas on board, 65.5 x 78.9
Insc: Shore 62, lr.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 844 IRON BARKS, KINGLAKE
1962
Oil on composite board, 60 x 49
Unsigned, undated.
Ill: PSG 1977 catalogue (cover).
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 32
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 845 AIREY'S INLET (Reverse of Cat. no. 844)
1962 (?)
Oil on composite board, 60 x 49
Unsigned, undated.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 846 GREY DAY
c.1962
Oil, 50.6 x 60.5
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 13, 200gns.
PSG 1977, No. 48.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 847 ROADSIDE AT MORNINGTON
1962
Oil on composite board, 32.4 x 41.5
Unsigned, undated.
Exh: CAG 1973, No. 28.
PSG 1977, No. 29.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 848 BUSHSCAPE, CLONBINANE
1962
Oil, 69.5 x 51.5
Exh: VAS (Autumn) 1962, No. 68, 250gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 28.
CAG 1973, No. 24.
PSG 1977, No. 33.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 849 BUSH PATTERNS
1962
Oil, 46.5 x 21.2
Exh: VAS solo 1962 (as 'Bush Pattern'), No. 53, 40gns.
PSG 1977, No. 34.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 850 RED GUMS
1962
Oil on composite board, 23 x 30
Unsigned, undated.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 51, 40gns.
PSG 1977, No. 25.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 851 PAPER MILLS
1962
Oil on composite board, 30.1 x 39.1
Unsigned, undated.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 63, 45gns.
PSG 1977, No. 26.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 852 EPPING
1962
Oil, 29.2 x 39
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 60, 40gns.
PSG 1977, No. 27.
Whereabouts unknown.
- 853 LANDSCAPE (unfinished)
(c.1962)
Oil on canvas, 64 x 77
Unsigned, undated.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 854 STORMY DAY
1962
Oil on composite board, 32.2 x 41.1
Unsigned, undated.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 24, 50gns.
PSG 1977, No. 36 (as 'Stormy Bay').
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 855 LANDSCAPE (Unfinished ?)
1962
Oil on composite board, 60.2 x 78.9
Insc: Shore 62, lr.
Coll: Mrs Shore, on loan to Victoria College, Toorak.
- 856 MORNINGTON BUSH
1962
Oil on composite board, 33.5 x 28.5
Insc: Shore 62, ll.
Verso: Mornington Bush Arnold Shore 1962
Prov: Given by Mrs Shore to current owner (Shore's
grand-niece), 1972.
Coll: Private collection, Sydney,
- 857 WET DAY
1962
Oil on canvas on composite board, 41.5 x 32.5
Insc: Verso: Wet Day Arnold Shore 1962
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 19 (as 'A Wet Day')
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 858 (RED GUMS)
1962
Oil on composite board, 29.5 x 39
Insc: Shore 62, ll.
Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owners, 1980 (?).
Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.

- 859 GREY VETERANS (AT WOLLERT)
 1962 (?)
 Oil on composite board, 41.2 x 32.5
 Unsigned, undated.
 Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 19, 60gns.
 HCAG 1969, No. 25.
 CAG 1973, No. 27.
 PSG 1977, No. 30 (as 'At Woolert')
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 860 YOUNG GUMS
 1962
 Oil on composite board, 24.3 x 34
 Insc: Shore 62, 11.
 Exh: PSG 1977, No. 23.
 Coll: Private collection, Melbourne.
- 861 YOUNG GUMS
 1962
 Oil on composite board, 24 x 39
 Insc: Shore 62, 1r.
 Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 32.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 862 BUSH GARDEN
 1962
 Oil on composite board, 33 x 43
 Coll: Mildura Arts Centre.
- 863 DESERTED COTTAGE
 1962
 Oil on canvas on board, 33 x 45
 Insc: Shore 62, 1r.
 Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, 1978.
 Coll: Latrobe University.
- 864 THE FARM SHED
 1962
 Oil on canvas on board, 29 x 39.5
 Insc: Shore 62, 1r.
 Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 30.
 Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, 1976.
 Coll: Victorian College of Pharmacy.
- 865 KANGAROO GROUND
 (c.1962)
 Oil on canvas on composite board, 43.3 x 34.4
 Unsigned, undated.
 Prov: Sold by Mrs Shore to current owner, 1974.
 Coll: Phillip Institute of Technology.
- 866 PUMPING SHED AT SOUTH MORANG
 1962 (April)
 Oil on composite board, 43 x 56
 Unsigned, undated.
 Exh: PSG 1977, No. 35.
 Prov: Recorded in Shore's diaries as being painted
 on April 1, 1962.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 867 SEA CLIFFS
1962
Oil on composite board, 51 x 72
Insc: Shore 62, lr.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 8, 250gns.
PSG 1977, No. 21 (as 'Anglesea Sea Coast').
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 868 WET EVENING ANGLESEA
1962
Oil on canvas on cardboard, 51.4 x 65.5
Insc: Shore, ll.
Ill: Hetherington, J., Australian Painters, 1963, p68.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 6, 250gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 24.
CAG 1973, No. 26.
Prov: Acquired by current owner (as 'Wet Evening'), 1975.
Coll: Art Gallery of Western Australia.
- 869 WET DAY
1962
Oil on canvas on board, 29.5 x 39.6
Insc: Shore 1962, lr.
Exh: VAS solo 1962, No. 17, 60gns.
HCAG 1969, No. 31 (incorrectly dated 1963).
PSG 1977, No. 38.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 870 SPRING SHOWERS
1962
Oil on composite board, 29.5 x 39
Insc: Shore 62, ll.
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 24.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 871 EVENING - SOUTH MORANG
1962
Oil
Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 23.
Whereabouts unknown.
- Victorian Artists' Society (Autumn) 1962:
- 872 FLINDERS HEADLAND, MORNING, No. 129, 60gns.
- Victorian Artists' Society one-man exhibition, November 1962:
- 873 OPEN CUT, No. 2, 500gns.
874 OCEAN COAST, No. 7, 250gns.
875 SUNSET, No. 9, 250gns.
876 NEAR PLENTY GORGE, No. 10, 200gns.
877 CLONBINANE, No. 11, 300gns.
878 SUMMER, No. 20, 40gns.
879 BUSH TRACK, No. 21, 60gns.
880 SUNLIGHT, No. 22, 60gns.
881 SILVER GUMS, No. 26, 50gns.

Victorian Artists' Society, 1962 (cont.)

- 882 BUSH, MORNINGTON, No. 32, 50gns.
 883 AFTER RAIN, No. 33, 50gns.
 884 CLIFF, No. 34, 50gns.
 885 TI-TREE, No. 36, 30gns.
 886 BUSH FOG, No. 37, 25gns.
 887 TRACK, No. 38, 30gns.
 888 TI-TREE, No. 41, 45gns.
 889 EDEN PARK, No. 46, 40gns.
 890 OLD TREES, No. 47, 40gns.
 891 THE STUMP, No. 48, 70gns.
 892 RED ROAD, No. 50, 30gns.
 893 ROAD FRINGE, No. 52, 60gns.
 894 OPPOSITE, No. 54, 45gns.
 895 SUN HARMONY, No. 56, 50gns.
 896 GARDEN, No. 55, 45gns.
 Also HCAG 1969, No. 27 (as 'Garden - South Morang').
 897 ANGLESEA, No. 57, 70gns.
 898 ENCHANTMENT, No. 58, 60gns.
 899 JEWEL LIKE, No. 59, 60gns.
 900 CORROBOREE GUM, No. 62, 60gns.
 901 CRISS CROSS, No. 64, 60gns.
 902 BUSH NOTE, No. 65, 40gns.
 903 GREY GUMS, No. 66, 40gns.
 904 BUSH DEPTH, No. 67, 40gns.
 905 VARIED GREENS, No. 68, 40gns.
- 906 VERTICAL BUSH
 1962-3 (?)
 Oil on composite board, 53 x 37
 Unsigned, undated.
 Exh: PSG 1977, No. 43.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 907 MOUNTAIN DAM (NEAR DANDENONG)
 1962-3 (?)
 Oil on composite board, 32.6 x 41.5
 Unsigned, undated.
 Exh: CAG 1973, No. 30.
 Coll: Mrs Shore.

- 908 RED ROOF (CHRYSOBEL CRESCENT)
1962-3 (?)
Oil on canvas on board, 39 x 30
Unsigned, undated.
Ill: PSG 1977 catalogue.
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 22.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 909 GRAVEL PIT, ANGLESEA
1963
Oil on canvas, 51 x 61.2
Insc: Shore 63, ll.
Ill: PSG 1977 catalogue.
Exh: HCAG 1969, No. 29.
CAG 1973, No. 32.
PSG 1977, No. 41.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 910 REFLECTIONS
c.1963
Oil on composite board, 29.5 x 38.6 (sight)
Unsigned, undated.
Insc: Verso: (Mrs Shore's hand) Framed after Arn's
death 1963.
Exh: PSG 1977, No. 40.
Fern Tree Gully Arts Society, June 1981.
Coll: Mrs Shore.
- 911 NEAR MORNINGTON
c.1963
Oil on composite board, 32.9 x 42
Unsigned, undated.
Coll: Mrs Shore.

Supplementary list; undated works known only through
auction catalogues:

- S1 A COUNTRY FARM HOUSE
Watercolour, 27 x 37
Insc: Shore, ll.
Prov: Joel's, May 1975, lot 248A; sold \$425.
- S2 COUNTRY ROAD
Oil on board, 31.5 x 34.5
Insc: Shore, lr.
Prov: Joel's, June 1976, lot 148; sold \$225.
- S3 RED CAMELLIAS
Oil on canvas, 50 x 50
Insc: Shore, lr.
Prov: Joel's, May 1978, lot 385, \$1300.
- S4 RED GUMS
Oil on board, 55 x 50
Insc: Shore, lr.
Prov: Joel's, May 1979, lot 59; sold \$2200.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WRITINGS OF ARNOLD SHORE

- 'Consider the Lilies', Manuscripts, No.2, June 1932, pp.74-5.
- 'The Enjoyment of Pictures I', Manuscripts, No.9, May 1934, pp.7-12.
- 'The Enjoyment of Pictures II', Manuscripts, No.10, August 1934, pp.15-8.
- 'The Enjoyment of Pictures III', Manuscripts, No.11, November 1934, pp.43-5.
- 'Women Through the Ages', Woman's Day, August 15, 1949.
- 'The Critic Paints a Picture', Australasian Post, July 10, 1952, p.13.
- 'Contemporary Australian Painting', Studio, 145:722, May 1953.
- Forty Years Seek and Find, privately printed, Melbourne, 1957.
- 'Flotsam and Jetsam', Daub, 1959-60, p.29
- Tom Roberts, O.U.P., Melbourne, 1964
- 'Abraham Louis Buvelot', unpublished manuscript in possession of Mrs Agnes Shore.
- Three autobiographical manuscripts, AMSA (c1940), AMSB (1962-3), AMSC (n.d.), and notes for lectures in possession of Mrs Agnes Shore.
- In addition, Shore wrote a large number of reviews and articles for the Sun (1934-5), the Argus (1949-57) and the Age (1957-63), and a series of articles for Australasian Post (1952-4).

BOOKS, ARTICLES AND THESES

- Anderson, E., 'Modernism and the Naturalists', Australian Quarterly, 1:1, March 1929, p.102.
- Basler, A., Maurice Utrillo, Paris, 1929. (In Shore's possession)
- Bell, Clive, 'A Re-Formation of the English School', Artwork, 2:7, Summer 1926, p.148.
- Bell, G.H.F., 'The Australian Academy: Its Influence on Australian Art', Australian Quarterly, 10:2, June 1938, p.46.
- Bell, Quentin, Bloomsbury, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1968.
- Besson, G., La Peinture Francaise (au XXe siecle), Paris, 1938. (In Shore's possession)
- Blainey, G., The Tyranny of Distance, Sun, Melbourne, 1966.
- Borlase, N., 'Three Decades of the Contemporary Art Society', Art and Australia, 6:1, June 1968, p.69.
- Bradbury, M. and McFarlane, J. (eds.), Modernism, Penguin, 1976.
- Brown, F., 'Recollections II: The Early Years of the New English Art Club', Artwork, 6:24, Winter 1930, p.269.
- Bunning, N.M., 'The Art of William Frater', Meanjin, 7:1, Autumn 1948, p.31.
- Burdett, B., 'Some Contemporary Australian Artists', Art in Australia, 3:29, September 1929.
- 'Art in Melbourne', Art in Australia, 3:42, February 1932, p.10.
- 'Arnold Shore', Art in Australia, 3:45, August 1932, p.22.
- 'George Bell', Art in Australia, 3:64, August 1936, p.26.
- 'Australian Art Today', Studio, 115:538, January 1938, p.3.
- 'Modern Art in Melbourne', Art in Australia, 3:73, November 1938, p.12.
- Byrne, J., 'The Modernist Push', Age (Melbourne), February 9 and 16, 1980.
- Casey, M., 'George Bell in Bourke Street', Art and Australia, 4:2, September 1966, p.120.
- "Chiaroscuro", 'An Australian Modernist School', Progress in Australia, 5:7, October 8, 1934, p.26.

- Christesen, C.B. (ed.), The Gallery on Eastern Hill, V.A.S., Melbourne, 1970.
- Clark, C.M.H., 'Melbourne: An Intellectual Tradition', Melbourne Historical Journal, No. 2, 1962.
- Colahan, C., Max Meldrum: His Art and Views, McCubbin, Melbourne, 1917.
- Collier, Hon. John, The Art of Portrait Painting, London, 1905.
- Cook, A.V., 'The Art of Arnold Shore', Meanjin, 9:1, Autumn 1950, p.39.
- Course, L., 'Tradition and New Accents: The Art of William Frater', in Christesen, C.B. (ed.), The Gallery on Eastern Hill, V.A.S., Melbourne, 1970.
- Cox, L.B., The National Gallery of Victoria 1861-1968: A Search for a Collection, NGV, Melbourne, 1970.
- Croll, R.H., I Recall: Collections and Recollections, Robertson and Mullens, Melbourne, 1939.
- de Maistre, R., 'Modern Art and the Australian Outlook', Art in Australia, 3:14, December 1925.
- Docker, J., Australian Cultural Elites: Intellectual Cultural Traditions in Melbourne and Sydney, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1974.
- Dutton, G., Russell Drysdale (rev. ed.), Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1981.
- Eagle, M., 'Modernism in Sydney in the 1920s', in Galbally, A. and Plant, M., Studies in Australian Art, Dept. of Fine Arts, University of Melbourne, 1978.
- Eagle, M. and Minchin, J., George Bell: Students, Friends, Influences, Deutscher, Melbourne, 1981.
- East, Sir Alfred, Art of Landscape Painting in Oil Colour, London, 1906.
- Finemore, B., Painting (The Arts in Australia series), Longmans, Melbourne, 1961.
- Freedom from Prejudice, NGV, Melbourne, 1977.
- Frater, W., 'A Certain Strangeness', Art in Australia, 4:1, March-May, 1941, p.57.
- 'Others Not So Heroic', Daub, 1959-60, p.18.
- Fry, R., Vision and Design, Penguin, 1961 (first pub. 1920).
- Gerraty, J., 'Basil Burdett: Critic and Entrepreneur', B.A. thesis, Monash University, 1978.

- Gray, A., 'In Focus: Frater, Shore and Bell', exhibition catalogue, Art Gallery of Western Australia, 1979.
- 'William Frater - Reconsidered', Art and Australia, 18:4, Winter 1981, p.363.
- Griffith, M., '"The Flukes of Thought": Modernism and its Beginnings in Australian Literature', in 'Modernism' seminar notes, AGNSW, 1982.
- Haese, R., 'Cultural Radicals in Australian Society 1937-1947', Ph.D. thesis, Monash University, 1979.
- Rebels and Precursors, Allen Lane, Melbourne, 1981.
- Hall, L.B., Art and Life, Hassell, Adelaide, 1918.
- Harris, I., 'Antimodernism in Australia between the Wars', in 'Modernism' seminar notes, AGNSW, 1982.
- Harrison, C., English Art and Modernism 1900-1939, Allen Lane/Indiana University Press, London, 1981.
- Helmer, J., 'George Bell (1878-1966): His Life and Work', M.A. thesis, University of Melbourne, 1979.
- George Bell Retrospective Exhibition catalogue, University Gallery, University of Melbourne, 1979.
- Henderson, A., 'Contemporary Art Advances', Art in Australia, 3:76, August 1939, p.13.
- Hetherington, J., Australian Painters: Forty Profiles, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1963.
- Hollinrake, R., Clarice Beckett: The Artist and her Circle, Macmillan, Melbourne, 1979.
- Hoff, U., 'Australian Paintings in the Royal Collections', Art and Australia, 17:3, March 1980, p.267.
- Hughes, R., The Art of Australia (rev. ed.), Penguin, 1970.
- The Shock of the New, BBC, London, 1980.
- Kaplan, P.E. and Manso, S. (eds.), Modern European Movements, 1900-1945: A Critical Anthology, Dutton, N.Y., 1977.
- Klepac, L., Russell Drysdale, Sydney, 1983.
- Konody, P.G., 'The Australian Exhibition in London', Art in Australia, 3:7, March 1924.
- Lawlor, A., 'Modern Art and the World of Appearances', Art in Australia, 3:62, February 1936, p.17.
- Arquebus, Ruskin Press, Melbourne, 1937.
- Eliminations, Ruskin Press, Melbourne, 1939.

- 'Cézanne and Posterity', Art in Australia, 4:6, June-August, 1942, p.10.
- Leger, F., 'Two Opinions', Stream, 1:2, August 1931.
- Lindsay, Daryl, The Leafy Tree: My Family, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1965.
- Lindsay, Lionel, 'Australian Art' in catalogue to Exhibition of Australian Art in London, 1923.
- 'Modernism with a Note on Arnold Shore', Art in Australia, 3:67, May 1937, p.24.
- Addled Art, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1942.
- Lynn, E., The Australian Landscape and its Artists, Bay Books, Sydney, 1977.
- Main, J.M., 'Painting: Taste and Market', in Davies, A.F. and Encel, S. (eds.), Australian Society: A Sociological Introduction, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1968.
- Mandle, W.F., Going It Alone: Australian National Identity in the Twentieth Century, Allen Lane, Melbourne, 1978.
- Marriott, C., Modern Art, Colour Ltd., London, 1917.
- McCaughey, P., 'The Later Work of Arnold Shore', exhibition catalogue, Powell Street Gallery, Melbourne, 1977.
- McCulloch, A., Encyclopaedia of Australian Art (rev. ed.), Hutchinson, Melbourne, 1977.
- Macdonald, J.S., 'Art in Victoria', Art in Australia, 3:19, March 1927, p.28.
- Australian Painting Desiderata, Lothian, Melbourne, 1958.
- MacGeorge, N., The Arts in Australia, Melbourne, 1948.
- McQueen, H., The Black Swan of Trespass: The Emergence of Modernist Painting in Australia to 1944, Alternative Publishing Company, Sydney, 1979.
- 'Document: What is Modernism?', in 'Modernism' seminar notes, AGNSW, 1982.
- Meldrum, M., The Science of Appearances as Formulated and Taught by Max Meldrum (arr. and ed. by Russell R. Foreman), Shepherd Press, Sydney, 1950.
- Minchin, J., 'Basil Burdett', Art and Australia, 17:4, Winter 1980, p.369.
- Moore, W., The Story of Australian Art (2 vols.), Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1934.

- Nibbi, G., 'Some Modern Masters', Stream, 1:2, August 1931, p.5.
- 'Is Australian Art Failing?', Herald (Melbourne), November 7, 1931, p.25.
- 'Ideas Behind Contemporary Art', Art in Australia, 3:76, August 1939, p.16.
- Nochlin, L., Impressionism and Post-Impressionism 1874-1904: Sources and Documents, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966.
- North, I. (et al.), The Art of Margaret Preston, Art Gallery Board of South Australia, 1980.
- Orpen, W., The Outline of Art, Putnam, N.Y., 1938 (first pub. 1924).
- 'Painting', dit (the RAN Bulletin), September 1945, p.131.
- Philipp, F. and Stewart, J. (eds.), In Honour of Daryl Lindsay, O.U.P., Melbourne, 1964.
- Plant, M., John Perceval, Lansdowne, Melbourne, 1971.
- Pollock, W.H., 'The Art of the Hon. John Collier', Art Annual, 1914.
- Preston, M., 'Why I Became a Convert to Modern Art', Home, June 1923, p.20.
- Rackham, B., 'Glass Painting as an Art for Today', in three parts, Artwork, Vol. 2, Nos. 5, 6, 7, 1926.
- Reed, J., Australian Landscape Painting, Longmans, Melbourne, 1965.
- Rewald, J., Post-Impressionism from Van Gogh to Gauguin, Museum of Modern Art, N.Y., 1956.
- Richardson, T. and Stangos, N., Concepts of Modern Art, Penguin, 1974.
- Rothenstein, J., Modern English Painters (3 vols.), London, 1952-1974.
- Matthew Smith, Beaverbrook, London, 1962.
- Rutter, F., 'Modern French Painting', Artwork, 3:10, June-August, 1927, p.113.
- Samra, E., 'Three Little Magazines in Australia: a Case For and Against Modernism', in 'Modernism' seminar notes, AGNSW, 1982.
- Serle, G., From Deserts the Prophets Come: The Creative Spirit in Australia, 1768-1972, Heinemann, Melbourne, 1974.

- Smith, B., Place, Taste and Tradition, Ure Smith, Sydney, 1945.
- Catalogue of Australian Oil Paintings in the National Art Gallery of New South Wales, 1876-1952, Sydney, 1953.
- Australian Painting 1788-1970, O.U.P., Melbourne, 1971.
- The Antipodean Manifesto: Essays in Art and History, O.U.P., Melbourne, 1976.
- Stephenson, P.R., The Foundations of Culture in Australia: An Essay Towards National Self-Respect, Miles, London, 1936.
- Sterling, C., Still Life Painting from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century (2nd rev. ed.), Harper and Row, N.Y., 1981.
- Sutherland, R., 'Max Meldrum', Art in Australia, 1:3, 1917.
- Stevens, J., 'Arnold Shore', Age (Melbourne), April 15, 1977, p.2.
- Thomas, Daniel, 'Art' in McLeod, A.L.--(ed.), The Pattern of Australian Culture, O.U.P., Melbourne, 1963.
- Outlines of Australian Art: The Joseph Brown Collection (rev. ed.), Macmillan, Melbourne, 1980.
- 'Australian Art', in Australian National Gallery: An Introduction, ANG, Canberra, 1982.
- Thomas, Laurie, The Most Noble Art of Them All, University of Queensland Press, 1976.
- Turnbull, C., Art Here: Buvelot to Nolan, Hawthorn Press, Melbourne, 1947.
- Ure Smith, S., 'Australian Art Today', Art in Australia, 1:11, December 1921.
- 'Australia in Art', Studio, 124:595, October 1942, p.115.
- (ed.), Present Day Art in Australia, Ure Smith, Sydney, 1945
- Wakelin, R., 'The Modern Art Movement in Australia', Art in Australia, 3:26, December 1928.
- 'Modernism', Art in Australia, 3:77, November 1939, p.41.
- 'Recollections of a Post-Impressionist', Art and Australia, 4:4, March 1967, p.290.
- Watney, S., English Post-Impressionism, Studio Vista, London, 1980.
- Whitelaw, B., Australian Drawings of the Thirties and Forties in the National Gallery of Victoria, NGV, Melbourne, 1980.
- 'William Frater', Art in Australia, 3:49, April 1933, p.20.

Wilson, H., 'Modern Art in Australia', Art in Australia,
3:16, June 1926, p.62.

Wynn, A., The Fortunes of Samuel Wynn: Winemaker, Humanist,
Zionist, Cassell, Melbourne, 1968.

Zubans, R., 'Max Meldrum', B.A. Honours thesis, University
of Melbourne, 1961.

Zwemmer, A., Paul Cézanne, Paris, 1930 (in French; in Shore's
possession).

EXHIBITION CATALOGUES

One-man exhibitions

- 1929 Athenaeum Gallery, Melbourne.
 1937 Macquarie Galleries, Sydney.
 1938 Athenaeum Gallery, Melbourne.
 1940 Velasquez Gallery, Melbourne.
 1941 Macquarie Galleries, Sydney.
 1945 Georges Gallery, Melbourne.
 1946 Georges Gallery, Melbourne.
 1947 Macquarie Galleries, Sydney.
 1949 Melbourne Book Club.
 1957 Australian Galleries, Melbourne.
 1960 Moreton Gallery, Brisbane.
 1962 Victorian Artists' Society.
 1969 Hawthorn City Art Gallery.
 1973 Castlemaine Art Gallery.
 1977 Powell Street Gallery, Melbourne.

Group exhibitions

- Victorian Artists' Society (1917-1918 and 1949-1962)
 Twenty Melbourne Painters (1923-1946)
 Contemporary Group (Melbourne: 1932-1937; Sydney: 1933-1945)
 Group 12 (1935-1938)
 Society of Artists (1936-1946)
 Australian Academy of Art (1938-1946)
 From 1949, Shore also exhibited irregularly with the Twenty Melbourne Painters and the Society of Artists.
 Joseph Brown Gallery catalogues (State Library of Victoria).
 Leonard Joel auction catalogues (State Library of Victoria).

MANUSCRIPTS

Basil Burdett papers, State Library of Victoria.
 William Frater papers, Meanjin archives, University of Melbourne, Mr Bill Harding, and Mrs Barbara Dare.
 Hoff, U., Foreword to Shore's proposed edition of Buvelot's letters.
 Adrian Lawlor papers, State Library of Victoria.
 Sir Daryl Lindsay papers, National Gallery of Victoria.
 Sir Lionel Lindsay papers, State Library of Victoria.
 J.S. MacDonald papers, National Library of Australia.
 Sir Keith Murdoch papers, National Library of Australia.
 Arnold Shore papers, Mrs Agnes Shore and Mrs Margaret Oliver.
 Victorian Artists' Society papers, State Library of Victoria.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

For reviews, articles and reproductions:

Age (Melbourne)
 Argus (Melbourne)
 Art and Australia (Sydney)
 Art in Australia (Sydney)
 Artwork (London)
 Bulletin (Sydney)
 Cahiers d'Art (Paris)
 Colour (London)
 Dial (New York)
 Formes (Paris)
 Herald (Melbourne)
 Home (Sydney)
 Manuscripts (Geelong)
 Meanjin (Melbourne)
 National Gallery of Victoria Bulletins
 Society of Artists' Book (Sydney)
 Stream (Melbourne)
 Studio (London)
 Sun (Melbourne)
 Sydney Morning Herald
 Table Talk (Sydney)

INTERVIEWS

This list includes the names of those who provided information which contributed significantly to the production of the thesis. It does not include the names of many others who generously granted access to paintings in their possession.

Borrack, John (Melbourne, February 27, 1982)
 Bryans, Lina (Melbourne, October 10 and 15, 1980)
 Casey, Lady Maie (Berwick, June 20, 1980)
 Christesen, Clem (Melbourne, May 16, 1980)
 Connellan, Mary (Melbourne, May 28, 1980)
 Daniell, Yvonne (Castlemaine, November 20, 1980)
 Dare, Barbara (Newstead, April 23, 1980)
 Darling, Sir James (Melbourne, May 21, 1980)
 den Hartog, Harry (Melbourne, September 7, 1981)
 Farmer, Joan (Melbourne, December 2, 1981)
 Frater, Arthur (Melbourne, April 29, 1980 and February 19, 1981)
 Frater, Robin (Melbourne, April 4, 1980)
 Fromholtz, Noel (Melbourne, February 6, 1982)
 Gill, Justin (Bendigo, April 29, 1981)
 Harding, Bill (Melbourne, April 22, 1980)
 Henderson, Tom (Melbourne, May 21, 1980 and July 8, 1980)
 Hill, Alice (Dean, June 1, 1981)
 Lawrence, David (Melbourne, September 10, 1982)
 Lindsay, Lady Joan (Melbourne, April 28, 1980)
 Millane, Bill (Melbourne, October 10, 1982)
 Mollison, James (Canberra, April 15, 1981)
 Newmark, Ariel (Melbourne, May 9, 1980)
 Oliver, Margaret (Melbourne, May 10, 1980)
 Pyke, Guelda (Melbourne, March 8, 1982)
 Shore, Agnes (Melbourne, on many occasions during 1980-1983)
 Shore, Norma (Sydney, September 2, 1981)
 Smith, Bernard (Melbourne, January 29, 1981)
 Sumner, Alan (Melbourne, July 19, 1980)

Tapes of recorded interviews kindly made available by the interviewers:

Laurence Course with William Frater; two interviews, 1970 and 1973.
 John Borrack with William Frater; 1965.
 Mary Eagle and Jan Minchin with (in particular) Lina Bryans, Geoff Jones, Antoinette Niven, Elizabeth Summons and Marjorie Woolcock; all 1981.